

Vol. V.

APRIL, 1884.

No. 2.

THE
CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN
REVIEW.



CONDUCTED BY REV. W. C. LOGAN.

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS:

REV. S. G. BURNET, D.D.,

REV. A. B. MILLER, D.D.,

REV. A. J. McGLUMPHY, D.D.

First Series, Vol. xx.
Second Series, Vol. xv.

Entered at the Postoffice at ST. LOUIS, MO., as Second Class matter.

CONTENTS.

I.—FUTURE HAPPINESS AND MISERY—IN WHAT THEY CHIEFLY CONSIST.	REV. S. G. BURNEY, D.D., Lebanon, Tenn., 121
II.—EXPOSITORY PREACHING.	REV. J. G. MERRILL, D.D., St. Louis, Mo., 139
III.—SCIENCE AND REVELATION.	REV. B. F. WHITEMORE, Arroyo Grande, Cal., 148
IV.—THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT UNDER THE OLD TESTAMENT DISPENSATION. II.	REV. F. R. EARLE, D.D., Boonsboro, Ark., 164
V.—CHRISTIAN CHARITY IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH. PROF. R. V. FOSTER, Lebanon, Tenn.,	184
VI.—HEBREW ORIGIN OF THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION. II.	H. H. M. IRWIN, Charlotte, N. C., 205
VII.—EDITORIAL.	224
VIII.—LITERARY NOTICES: Scriptural Idea of Man; The Theory of Morals; The Yoke of Christ,	226
IX.—GENERAL NOTES: A Great Discovery in Apostolic Church History; Baalbec,	232

B. F. Burckhead

THE REVIEW.

APRIL, 1884.

FUTURE HAPPINESS AND MISERY—IN WHAT THEY CHIEFLY CONSIST.

ATHEISM is the negation of intelligent first Cause, a self-existent, personal God ; the negation of the immortality of the mind, of fundamental moral distinctions, of moral retribution, of future happiness and misery. The *summum bonum* of atheism consists in such pleasures and enjoyments as time and sense alone can give ; its direct evils consist exclusively of the ills to which flesh is heir. According to atheism, man owes nothing to God, because there is no God ; nothing to the state in which he lives, because there are no moral obligations ; but he is at liberty to rule it, or use it, or destroy it, as may best comport with his ambition or his more sensual propensities. He owes nothing to his family, but is at perfect liberty to use them as slaves, even as beasts. According to his whims, God is a myth ; man, an accident ; moral obligation, an illusion ; conscience, a prejudice ; immortality, a dream ; heaven, a happy delusion, and hell, a vulgar scare-crow. All human acts are equally right and wrong, equally virtuous and vicious ; all characters equally meritorious, and all religion a vulgar superstition. Or, strictly speaking, there is no right, no wrong, no virtue, no vice, no merit, no demerit, no true religion.

Were all men consistent, practical atheists, what a

world ours would be. Or rather, how soon would consistent practical atheism depopulate the earth. Fortunately for humanity, while nihilists seem able by their threadbare sophistries to blind their own eyes, they are not able to blind the eyes of all other men. While they seem able to convert the God-given faculty of reason into an engine of destruction to themselves, they are not able therewith to deal destruction to all others; while they seem able to stifle the voice of God within themselves, they utterly fail to stifle it in the masses. But in spite of all the learned nonsense, and crazy logic, and blustering declamations of atheists of all schools, the great masses of mankind ever have, do now, and ever will, believe in an intelligent and personal God, in the immortality of the soul, in moral distinctions, in retribution, in future happiness and misery. These several and logically connected articles of faith, common to the masses of men in all nations, are supported by evidence no less trustworthy than mathematical demonstration itself. This being true, it is pertinent to inquire, in what does this future good and ill, this future happiness and misery chiefly consist? This is a question of the deepest practical interest, and one withal concerning which many pious people, and still more impious people, have very confused and delusive opinions. With the humble hope of rendering some valuable assistance to such, the writer will address himself to the question, "Future Happiness and Misery—in What do They Chiefly Consist?"

1. Happiness and misery have their domain neither in the intelligence nor in the will, but exclusively in the sensibility. Beings possessed of the faculty of intellection, but void of the power of emotion, if such exist, are constitutionally incapable both of mental

pleasure and pain, happiness and misery ; also incapable of volition, because they could have no incentive to action ; also incapable of consciousness and of conscience, for these functions depend not less on the sensibility than on the intelligence ; also incapable of merit or demerit, for these depend upon freedom of the will and a consciousness of the rightness and wrongness of the motives of volition or action. Consequently such beings would be incapable of moral government, insusceptible of rewards and punishments, of happiness and misery. But men are not such—they are endowed with sensibilities, such as render them capable of voluntary action, of moral government, and of the highest happiness and deepest misery.

2. Neither the intelligence nor the sensibilities are active in any proper sense. They do not act, but are rather acted upon, the will alone being properly active. The sensibility is acted upon only through the intelligence. No perception, no emotion. On the contrary there is no perception without a corresponding emotion, for we do not know that we think or perceive except by the testimony of consciousness, which is a form of feeling.

3. Every sensation is, from the nature of things, either pleasant or unpleasant, agreeable or disagreeable. It is inadmissible to suppose any emotion to be neither agreeable nor disagreeable, because we are made conscious of the emotion only by its agreeableness or disagreeableness.

4. As every perception is followed by its own proper sensation, and every sensation is more or less agreeable or disagreeable, it inevitably follows that all the objects of perception contribute somewhat to our happiness or unhappiness.

5. It is, however, a fact well attested by universal experience that there is no inherent power in the objects of perception themselves to determine the character of the emotion as to its agreeableness or disagreeableness; for while every object of perception must produce its proper sensation, the character of the sensation is determined by the pre-existent state of the recipient mind. Hence the well known fact that what is a source of pleasure to some minds is a cause of pain to others. Hence no fact in psychological science can be better established than that human happiness and misery are determined by the correlation existing between the sensibilities and the objects of perception.

To say that we love what is pleasant, or agreeable, or desirable, and hate the opposite of these things, is little more than a truism, for whatever is pleasant, agreeable, &c., is of necessity an object of love, more or less ardent, and the opposite emotions are of necessity objects of hatred, hatred more or less intense. All happiness consists of pleasant or agreeable emotions, all unhappiness consists of painful or disagreeable emotions. But all sources of agreeable emotion are objects of love. Hence all happiness consists in loving. The converse is equally true. All unhappiness or misery consists in painful or disagreeable emotions. But all sources of disagreeable emotion are objects of hatred. Hence all unhappiness consists in hating. Dr. Haven says: "As the *simple emotions* are all but so many modes and forms of the feeling of *joy*, and its opposite, *sorrow*, so the *affections* are but so many different modifications of the one comprehensive principle of *love*, and its opposite, *hate*."

A pagan philosopher happily stumbles upon the partial truth that happiness consists in loving, and the

measure of happiness in the multitude of objects loved. A Christian philosopher would perhaps prefer to say that happiness consists in loving, and the measure of happiness in the intensity of love, and its durability on the perpetuity of the fruitional relationship of the subject and object of love. Better than the teaching of the psychologist, whether pagan or Christian, is the teaching of the Bible. This supreme authority teaches from beginning to end, in various and most significant forms of presentation, that the highest mental enjoyment attainable in the present and future consists in such a state of mental and complacent love between the creature and the Creator as to constitute men in the highest sense the children of God. The purest, the highest, the most enduring happiness of which rational creatures are capable, consists in loving him who first loved them, and because he first loved them. "Blessed (happy) are they who keep his commandments." "This is love, that we walk after his commandments." "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me, and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father." They that love God keep his commandments, and they that keep his commandments are blessed—happy. These texts resolve happiness, the happiness of heaven, into love.

We may, perhaps, *receive* a better idea both of the truthfulness and value of these statements if grouped as nearly as possible into one view—the various classes of objects whence come our happiness and misery.

1. A large part of our enjoyment comes through our sense perception. Suppose every object of sense to be in such perfect correlation to our sensibility as to become the objects of approbation and a source of the highest enjoyment of which we are capable. Every ob-

ject of vision most beautiful, every sound a thrill of sweetest harmony, every taste exquisitely delightful, every touch a servitor of pleasure, and every odor perfectly delicious. We would then realize the full measure of happiness of which our physical organization is capable. Such a state of things would prove to us a physical or sensuous heaven. More of such pleasure we could neither covet nor enjoy. More of enjoyment would be impossible without senses of greater capacities or higher functions.

2. But while all things about us, above us, around us, beneath us, are hypothetically just such as to become objects of unqualified approbation, or love, suppose all things within us were in their normal state—all our intellectual activities and processes, all our moral emotions objects only of approbation and sources of enjoyment; every thought pertaining to the pure, the good, the beautiful, and itself an object of approval, and a source of pleasure; every volition, every purpose, every act, contributing its full measure of delight to the sensibilities; every retrospect a re-enjoyment of the past; every prospect the pledge and prelude of fuller good; conscience always approving. In such a state, everything within the range of our conception would be robed in supreme loveliness, and every corresponding emotion supremely agreeable; consequently every object of perception would contribute to our happiness. If such a state of things existed, and we could give to it the immutable seal of eternity, would we not think it heaven, feel it heaven, call it heaven? Would it not be a veritable heaven to us? What truer or sweeter, or brighter, or better heaven would be possible to us? What truer, or sweeter, or brighter heaven could the angels enjoy?

3. But suppose the reverse of this be true—every object of sense perception an object of aversion, of dread, of hatred; every sight a dreadful deformity; every sound the sum of all discords; every taste most nauseous; every odor offensive; every touch exquisitely painful; every sense only a source of unmitigated and quenchless torment, and therefore an object of utter hatred. Such a state would properly be deemed a physical hell.

4. But while every object of sense is hypothetically a source of torment and an object of hatred, suppose every object of thought and reflection was an object of pure hatred, and nothing approvable, nothing lovable. To what deeper misery could the mind be subjected? If the unalterable stamp of eternity could be given to this state of things, would we not think it hell, feel it hell, call it hell? Can we conceive of a worse hell than this state of things and its natural consequences could create? No proposition is truer or more defensible than that love is the source and measure of human happiness; hatred the source and measure of human misery. Heaven is perfectly happy only because it is full of love; every object of perception an object of love, and hence a source of unalloyed blessedness. Earth is neither perfectly happy nor perfectly miserable because it is neither perfectly full of love nor of hate. In some individuals the measure of bliss exceeds the measure of woe, because their measure of love exceeds that of hate. In others the measure of woe exceeds that of bliss, because their hatred is greater or more intense than their love. Hell is completely miserable because of utter hate. Whoever dreamed that love, that divine principle ordained of God as a golden chain to bind the moral world in harmony, could find a dwell-

ing place in that place or state called hell? or that aught else than utmost woe, the hapless product of remorseless hate, could there reign? To *fill* earth with *love* is to convert it into heaven; to fill it with hate is to convert it into hell. Such is the concurrent teaching of philosophy, of revelation, of observation and experience.

These facts furnish to every man who will properly consider the matter an infallible guide to the highest possible happiness in this life, and to perfect happiness in the life to come. A personal application of these general principles can hardly fail to be of practical advantage.

Every man is presumed to be more or less happy. This happiness consists in the agreeable correlation subsisting between the susceptibilities of the mind and certain objects of perception and reflection. These objects are so diverse and so numerous as to be incapable of individualization. They, however, may be easily classed with an accuracy sufficient for practical purposes. A good general classification is that given by St. Paul, when he enjoins the Colossians to set their "affections on things above, and not on things on the earth." Things on the earth comprise only the object of sense, secular and sensual and sensuous good—all strictly temporal good. Things above comprise things spiritual and heavenly in kind, and immutable and eternal. The classification is complete. Some object, in one or the other of these classes, commands the supreme affection of every human heart, and is consequently the chief source of pleasure to those over whose affections it reigns supreme.

Without attempting nice discriminations, those who set their affections on things upon the earth may be divided into the following classes:

1. Those devoted to sensual pleasure, who aspire to no enjoyment superior in kind to those common to the brute creation. The chief uses to which they devote their intellects seem to be the invention of means by which to enlarge, intensify the pleasures common to other animals. Nothing beyond this is to them covetable or enjoyable, or worth living for.

2. Others, no less reprehensible than the above described class, care little for pure animal pleasure—are characterized by a remorseless greed of gold—the representative of earthly possessions. These mammon worshipers often sacrifice health, and ease, and honor, and even life itself, in quest of the object of their supreme love. This they do, because, to their perverse hearts, gold is the supreme good.

3. A third class, rising above the grosser pleasures of the sensualists, seek their chief pleasures in intellectual and æsthetical pursuits. These may be not inappropriately styled self-worshipers, because they, more than others, look to themselves, their own abilities, acquirements and pursuits, as the supreme sources of their happiness.

4. Others worship at the shrine of ambition, covetous of distinctions, rather than of a good reputation; of fame, rather than of character. All other enjoyments are, in their esteem, inferior to those they purport to themselves.

5. Another and better class of those whose supreme love is set upon the earth, are such as subordinate their animal appetites to the dominion of their reason, and derive their highest enjoyment from the objects of their domestic and social affections. This is at once the purest and highest and most enduring pleasure earth can give, and, but for this, the sorrows of earth would

far exceed its joys. Earth would bear a much stronger resemblance to hell than to heaven.

Now, let it be assumed that all these classes are equally happy in the enjoyment of the objects of their supreme love. Still it is manifest to all that will open their eyes to the facts around them that all this happiness is not only very meager in measure, but is held by a very uncertain tenure, and, at best, is exceedingly short lived. Those who worship at the shrine of sensual pleasure procure their enjoyments at a ruinous sacrifice, generally at the sacrifice of respectability, of independence, of domestic tranquility, health, and always of good conscience. These sacrifices always largely counteract, and generally far over-balance their pleasure. Similar if not equal sacrifices are incurred by all other classes whose supreme love is set upon "things upon the earth," rendering it doubtful in most cases whether the aggregate of happiness or misery predominates. But if no such sacrifices were incurred, if the measure of enjoyment for the present was full, still it is from a dire necessity of only short duration. The objects of supreme affection must be in present possession, or in certain prospects, before they can impart present enjoyment. Hence, the entire separation of the loving subject and the object loved is the extinction of all the happiness that object is capable of affording to that heart.

Two events, both in the near future, imperil the happiness any individual may receive from the love of things on the earth—(a) the objects of love and sources of happiness may change; (b) the loving subjects of love may change and lose forever the capacity to derive pleasure from these objects. How many thousands of those who worship at the shrine of sensual

pleasure are to-day deprived of the means of gratifying their sensual appetites, and on this account carry in their bosoms daily the hungering of a raging passion. How many thousands of others have indulged, until indulgence itself, in its most extravagant form, utterly fails to satisfy—ever eating but hungering still; ever drinking but thirsting still—the more than brutalized soul ever clamoring for more than the overtaxed physical organism is able to give. In the nature of the case there is no happiness for such while in this condition, and there is only the slightest hope for any change for the better.

But if we had an assurance that the objects whence we draw our sensual pleasures would never fail us, and that our physical organization would never become incapable of meeting the utmost demands of the soul, still we are confronted with the fearful truth, that we must die. If our idols do not lose their power to satisfy us, if they are not torn from us, we must be torn from them. Death severs the connection between the soul and these objects of sensual pleasure, and fixes between them an impassable gulf. The entire organization upon which the sensualist is wont to depend for enjoyment dissolves to dust, and leaves the soul hungering, longing for its ministrations. The soul, fettered by the force of irresistible habit, and incapable of pleasure from things above, suffers inconceivable misery—a misery only feebly presaged by one dying of hunger or thirst. The sufferings of the fabulous Tantalus are nothing in comparison. More or less analagous to the condition of the sensualist is that of all who set their supreme love “upon things upon the earth,” and not “upon things above.”

Let any such look in his own heart and determine

for himself the true state of his affections and the objects of supreme delight, whence he derives his chief pleasure, and then suppose those things to be taken from him, or he from them. He cannot fail to see, aye, to feel the folly—rather the madness of attempting to satisfy the demands of immortal mind with the richest treasures earth can give. Is it to sensual pleasure we trust? They must fail. Or to gold? It must canker. Or to power and fame? They are but empty bubbles on the sea of life. Or to intellectual and æsthetical culture? They at the best only partially satisfy the intellectual and æsthetical side of the soul, leaving the deeper yearning unsatisfied and without genial companionship. Or to social and domestic relations—father, mother, husband, wife, child, or friend, to one or all? These ties, the sweetest and strongest belonging to earth, must all dissolve. Death changes all, and stops forever the fountains of merely earthly enjoyment, however innocent and pure, however criminal and vicious. The soul, while embodied, is in time and capable of earthly enjoyments; disembodied, it is in eternity and incapable of sensual delight. The mind, whose sole objects of love are earthly things, and whose entire dependence for happiness is these earthly things, when disembodied finds itself bereft of every object of love and every source of pleasure. If we can form any distinct and vivid conception of a man to whom every sense perception—every sight, every sound, every taste, every touch, and every odor, is an object of hatred and source of pain, and to whom every thought is bitter and every creation of the imagination a frightful picture of remorse and despair—then we can form some conception of an earthly hell. If we can conceive of such a mind separate from the body with-

out any moral renovation, any change in the objects of its affections, yet with a sensibility made intensely more vivid and with all its native sympathies turned to gall, and allow this state to be eternal, then we can form some idea of the self-inflicted punishment of those whose supreme love is lavished upon worldly things. In the spirit world such a soul finds nothing to love. An impassable gulf separates between them and the former objects of their delight. On the contrary, every object of perception is an object of positive aversion, and consequently a source of torment. It is not conceivable that any thing in hell or heaven can become a source of enjoyment to such a soul. In the former is an abundance of sin; but the lost one cannot love it, never did love it for its own sake, but only as a means to his enjoyment. But now having lost all power to give pleasure, and having precluded the love of things above from the heart, and rendered the love that is spiritual and pure and good forever impossible, becomes an object of utter hate and source of torment. There, too, is an indefinable number of other lost spirits, in the same state; some, perhaps, boon companions in sin while in the body. The wicked in this life, so far as they influence one another, only mutually stimulate each other by their example, if not by more reprehensible means, to persistence in wickedness; and, according to the constitution of human nature, cannot love to look with complacency upon those that have been accessory to their ruin. Mutual hate and crimination and recrimination is the only state possible to companions in sin in this state. The rich man did not want his five brethren with him in his state of torment. Their presence, he deemed, would not abate but rather increase that torment.

We can conceive of nothing in perdition that can possibly become objects of love, in such a sense as to become sources of enjoyment, to disembodied souls that have never learned to love those things that are above. On the contrary, all is hatred, and consequently misery. There is nothing in heaven, in their esteem, lovely nor to them loveable. Their carnal hearts were always enmity against God—always insubordinate to his will. They were always enemies to him by wicked works. Hating God, and his Christ, and holiness, while in the body, they carry all their hatred into the spirit world. Their hatred, instead of being abated by the change in their condition, is rather intensified, and their misery proportionably increased. Were such admitted into the intense glories of a local heaven, it would probably be less tolerable than the torments of a local hell. Calling for rocks and mountains to fall upon them and hide them from the face of him that sitteth upon the throne, and from the wrath of the lamb, they would gladly seek refuge in the less uncongenial realities of perdition.

If lost souls have friends in heaven, whom they once dearly loved, such friends can afford them no relief, however willing they might be to do so. The loss of these friends on the impassable gulf that forever separates the soul from the objects of its love becomes a source of positive and unmitigated torment. Had it been possible, Lazarus, it is presumed, would gladly have dipped the tip of his finger in water and cooled the tongue of the rich man "tormented in this flame." This was morally impossible; and for the same reason it is morally impossible for the good in heaven to bring the slightest relief to the lost. This state of torment must continue as long as the moral state of a lost soul

remains unchanged. As such a change has become impossible, of course the suffering must be eternal.

All happiness consists in loving; all misery in hating. But the disembodied carnally-minded find nothing in eternity, in heaven, or in hell, that they can love; and hence are rendered by their own voluntary states of mind utterly and forever incapable of enjoyment, cut off by death from all the objects in which they once delighted, and whence they drew all their pleasures; and filled with an ever-growing enmity against God and Christ and whatever pertains to holiness, they experience nothing but the fruits of universal hatred—a hatred powerless to harm the object, but omnipotent to torment the subject. Out of this state of helpless misery grew, as its natural consequences, remorse and despair, which complete the ruin of the unregenerate soul.

How different and how superior in time and eternity the condition of those who set their supreme affections “on things above,” and not on things on the earth, who have learned to love God, and his Christ, to love truth and holiness. They recognize God as their provident and gracious Father, therefore, love him, and are happy according to the intensity of that love; recognize Christ as their all-suffering Savior, and therefore love him and are happy; recognize heaven as their eternal home, and a blissful immortality as their sure reward, and the recognition fills them with the most joyful emotions.

These facts largely refine the pleasures of sense—all the lawful pleasures of sense—and greatly mitigate all the natural evils of the present life; they give the spiritually minded an immense advantage over the carnally minded. The only pleasures peculiar to the carnally

minded are the pleasures of sin—pleasures alike offensive to God and pernicious to men, to their bodies, and to their souls; pleasures, the sinfulness of which often cloud the brightest skies, stifle the highest earthly pleasures, and convert the sweetest relations of life into fountains of gall. All earthly enjoyments are lawful to the spiritually minded, except such as are sinful. In denying themselves sinful pleasures, they honor God, and render high service to themselves. The only restriction in these pleasures is temperance, a due moderation in their use. This restriction is a guarantee against a loathsome satiety consequent upon excess. Who is the happier of the two, the temperate or the intemperate man? All are subjects to the same natural evils; but, in relation to these, the spiritually minded man has a decided advantage over the carnally minded. With the former, all earthly good is a subordinate object of interest, consequently subordinate source of pleasure. With the latter, earthly good is the supreme object of interest, and of course the supreme source of enjoyment. If the lover of the world loses his health, his property, his kindred and friends, these being the supreme, the only sources of his enjoyment, he is rendered inevitably more miserable than the lover of things above would be under similar circumstances. If the latter is personally afflicted, he remembers that his affliction shall work out for him a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory. The lover of the world has no such assurance. If the spiritually minded loses his earthly treasures, he reminds himself that his heart and his richer treasures are in heaven, where “moth and rust do not corrupt.” The lover of the world has no such treasure. If the former is bereaved of his dearest friends, he cherishes the assurance of a

happy reunion in the mansions of love, prepared for the reception of the household of faith, where friends and family loved ones, long parted, "meet to part no more." The latter have no such assurance, but are without God, without hope. When death comes to him whose supreme love is set upon spiritual things, he has strong consolation in hope of a happy and glorious future. "The righteous has hope in his death." The lover of the world has no such consolation, but has frightful apprehensions of the "dark forever."

Death is the end of all the pleasures of the wicked, the end of all the troubles of the righteous. The disparity between the righteous and the wicked is inconceivably greater in the disembodied state than it can be in the present state. Death is purely a physical event. It does not change the temper of the heart or the objects of affection. The moral condition of the heart and the objects of its affections and desires remain the same after death as before. Death separates the wicked forever from the objects of their love, and brings them in contact only with the objects of irreconcilable hate. On the contrary, it separates the righteous from the objects of their aversion and sources of tribulation, and brings them in closer companionship with the objects of their love and desires. Having learned while in the body to love God and their neighbors, though imperfectly yet truly, they in the disembodied state love God with all the mind, heart and soul, and their neighbors as themselves, and are consequently happy to the full extent of their capacity. What the righteous love the wicked hate, and are consequently miserable to the full extent of their capacity.

From this hasty sketch, incomplete as it is, it is suf-

ficiently manifest that the doctrine of retribution, future reward and punishments, has a rational basis in the philosophy of the human mind. This, too, is the doctrine taught by him who spake as never man spake: "Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and Lazarus, evil things; but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented."

To *love perfectly* and *be perfectly loved*, is heaven;
to *hate thoroughly* and *be thoroughly hated*, is hell.

S. G. BURNEY.

EXPOSITORY PREACHING.*

THE foremost preacher of America, if not of the world, at the present moment, defines preaching in one short sentence. "It is," he says, "the communication of truth by man to men." Preaching has in it two essential elements, truth and personality. The truth which in the main is to be preached is God's Word. This can be and is treated in different ways by the preacher. These differing methods are named the textual, the topical, and the expository. The latter form of the sermon is the one assigned me to consider to-day.

Prof. Shedd defines the expository sermon by calling it an explanatory discourse, saying that its purpose is to unfold the meaning of a connected paragraph or section of Scripture in a more detailed manner than is consistent with the structure of either the topical or the textual sermon. Some refuse to consider an expository discourse a sermon. They do so because they do not have the largest thought concerning sermons, and because many so-called expository sermons are in fact pages from a commentary; and sometimes such pages as have been wittily likened to a muddy pool, on the surface of which the texts of God's Word float like pond lilies, the only objects of beauty or delight.

Expository *preaching* must contain the *personality* of the preacher. It will have the elements of oratory. It can contain argument, description, illustration, appeal. It will have, as all true sermons must, a beginning, a

*Read before the Evangelical Alliance at St. Louis, Jan. 28, 1884.

middle and an end. It will rarely send a rifle bullet, as does the topical sermon with its one idea, but it will bring down the game with a handful of shot.

Another item. The expository sermon will differ from an exposition in the material employed. The expositor may do a deal of preaching, but he goes on from passage to passage. The expository preacher selects a passage which is, in a sense, a unit, and makes paramount the thought that the truth which he finds he is personally to deliver to his hearers. In other words, he keeps in mind his auditors no less than his message, knowing right well that nothing is more lethargic in the pulpit than the droning exposition of the mere pedagogue.

Another item. Genuine expository preaching has a modern counterfeit, in a style of sermon, so called, which consists of the ringing of changes upon a certain number of texts. It takes a text, goes to the well-thumbed Bagster, traces out the parallel passages, shakes them together, and calls the result a Bible reading or sermon, according to the place of its delivery and the amount of gesture or other externals of oratory employed in its presentation. Such preaching has come to regard the parallel passages and references as well nigh if not quite inspired. Its admirers declare their freedom from the bondage of commentators, only to fall into bondage to a single interpreter, who has made the letter of Scripture rather than its spirit and scope his study.

It is to the Scotch pulpits, I take it, that we must go to find the best exemplars of expository preaching. And of them none ranks higher in this regard than Rev. Wm. Arnot, some of whose volumes of sermons have been a great inspiration to many an American preacher.

A friend of mine, privileged to hear Mr. Arnot, thus describes him: "The text was the first six verses of the first chapter of James. The discourse, meager in promise, was magnificent in performance. There was unity throughout the whole, and yet a most delightful variety. Now the preacher would read a careful exegesis and point out little niceties of the text; now he would illustrate by striking and felicitous similes or incidents from history; then he would lean down over the pulpit and talk with fatherly tenderness; again he would straighten himself to his full commanding height and burst out in a general denunciation of oppression and fraud; and the ending was as bright as a summer sky after a storm. I glanced over the audience; all had their Bibles open as well as their eyes and ears. There were many children and youth, and they looked pleased as well as the older people." But it should be remembered that a very great reason if not the principal reason why the Scottish pulpit has such princes in the pulpit as expository preachers, is because their pews are full of Bibles and people who have studied the Bible. Dr. Taylor, of New York, calls this to mind in what he denominates "the inspiring rustle of hundreds of Bibles in a Scottish congregation."

And now, having defined and illustrated my theme, allow me to mention a few of the advantages and disadvantages of expository preaching;

First—Its disadvantages. It is in danger of becoming dull and pointless. It has been likened to heat-lightning that quivers over many topics and strikes nowhere. It is, unless care is used, apt to be vague and at the same time narrow. A preacher must be constantly on his guard, or he will degenerate into a

mere skillful interpreter of single texts. A minute study of parts of a book often prevents a grand conception of its whole.

Another danger comes from the tendency to wander off into side issues, suggested by the different texts. A sermon will then be like a river overflowing its banks, lazily moving on, rather than the torrent confined within bounds, bearing everything before it.

Another disadvantage is in the fact that the modern Sunday-school covers the ground which was once traveled by the expository preacher. And yet I am inclined to think this advantage is not as great as it at first appears. When a field has been skimmed over by surface plowing, there is the more need, once in a while, of a good subsoiling. There is nothing of greater importance to-day than thoroughness in the study of God's Word; and, provided a preacher has the grit and the grace to study the Bible faithfully, and bring the results rather than the processes to his people, he will find that although they may not be amazed at his learning as they would be if he paraded the processes at the expense of the result, they will be moved by the truth, which, having cost hard work to mine, will be valued by him who has dug for the gold and by them who know the worth of true coin. And here we may take to ourselves the comfort of knowing that pedantic display of processes rarely pays. The people do not care what Olshausen, Lange, or any other great name may have thought or written. There are too many in the pews who are as ignorant of these names as was the merchant, who, when the conversation turned on William Shakespeare, asked, "Where does that fellow do business anyway?"

One other danger is in the fact that not all congregations are capable of appreciating expository preaching.

Men fail in the ministry as in other avocations because they do not have the sense to estimate aright their environment. A dull or an illiterate people will not enjoy a good expository sermon. Men who have made this kind of preaching a very great success with a cultured congregation, have found to their dismay that a change of parishes, even though their salaries are increased, makes their past labors of no advantage. Churches which pay the largest salaries do not always contain the most intelligence.

But it is time to consider some of the more obvious advantages of expository preaching:

1. It will lead the ministry and the churches to regard with greater reverence a "Thus saith the Lord." Our religious life and thought is waning because the modern pulpit has failed to secure the authority of God's Word. We have reversed Paul's custom, and preach ourselves, not Christ the Lord. We do not have faith in the truth enough to trust it to stand alone. We bolster it up with our arguments. We make it presentable in our essays. If we did but know it, there is an impressiveness and a might in God's Word, faithfully presented, that will do a world more good than the melodramatic sensational methods of many a modern sermon.

2. We shall, by a faithful study of God's Word consecutively, gain the genuine orthodoxy. There is more truth than I wish was the case in the remark of Bishop Warberton, as quoted in Priestly's memoirs. "I have heard frequent use," said Lord Landrich, "of the words orthodoxy and heterodoxy, but I confess myself at a loss to know precisely what they mean." "Orthodoxy, my Lord," said the Bishop in a whisper, "orthodoxy is my doxy—heterodoxy is another man's

doxy." The genuine expositor of the Scriptures does not care what his doxy or your doxy may be. He is solely curious to know what God's truth is. Like a genuine man of science, he does not study facts to establish a theory, but to learn the truth. He does not go to the Bible to find proof texts for a catechism, or creed, or ordinance, but to learn what the Bible teaches. "The Bible is his book upon theology, and he is not afraid to take it as a whole, and in course."

I am aware that it is with justice said that all isms and doxies can be drawn out of the Bible, but it is mainly due to the fact that these isms were on the hooks of those who fish for them. Anything can be proved pure—almost any book—if men take a sentence here and a sentence there, and have no regard for the connection. It is a mercy that by the new revision no modern preacher can cry out against women's head-dress by quoting against them, "topnot come down." No other book but the Bible could have endured the strain which such sacrilege has placed upon God's Word. Any man who tampers with God's Word to establish his pet theory, however sacred and apparently essential that theory may be, is rightly exposed to the woe uttered by Paul against those who do evil, that good may come, whose condemnation is just. If there were more expository preachers in our pulpits, there would be fewer Congregational, fewer Presbyterian, fewer Baptist, fewer Methodist, and more Evangelical Alliance preachers.

A man who is a faithful exegete is like a judge on the bench—it would stain his ermine to be retained as an attorney for Luther, Calvin, Wesley, Park, Hodge, or any leader in theologic thought. He will scorn to read into sacred writ his private opinions upon morals,

reform or religion. He is after the pure gold, and if he digs he will find it, for it is there.

3. Exegetical preaching gives a grand vantage ground whence to make attack upon sins and errors concerning which the world says—hands off! You can do much better execution with your rifle if you can stand behind a fortification, and thus avoid being a target for your enemy. When a preacher takes passage after passage in course his hearers have no occasion to take into account his personality. If they are hit, it is by the force behind the breastworks, and that must be stormed and carried before that force can be silenced. Green soldiers think that courage consists in exposing oneself. The brave old veteran believes that there is just as much courage and vastly more execution to be in the breastwork. There are certain errors and vices which a man has no occasion to attack on his personal responsibility. If he do it, men may regard him bigoted, cynical, personal. But, if the text or passage of the day call for a denunciation of these sins and vices, no one can find fault. A friend of mine who has made the practice of preaching expository sermons thus puts, as I take it, his experience in this regard: "Your young people are engaged in those maudlin and demoralizing games of which the chief relish consists in forfeits. Meddle with them, and you make yourself odious and perhaps ridiculous, but if you must treat the text, 'Salute one another with a holy kiss,' you can safely and effectively free your mind in regard to this promiscuous and unholy osculation. Your parishioners may be failing to pay their debts, the salary among the rest; they make compromises and go through bankruptcy because they are more profitable than legitimate business. What a civi

triumph the pastor obtains as he quietly remarks: The passage which comes before us to-day *in course* is, "Owe no man anything." And so on. A man can in this way treat of delicate and distasteful topics with naturalness and freedom.

4. While doubtless an expository sermon, if well done, will take more time in proportion than a topical one, expository preaching, on the whole, will save time. It comes about in this way: We, all of us, have difficulty often in settling down upon texts and themes. Not that we ever fail of finding the Bible full of good texts to preach upon, and themes to be discussed, but there seems to be no adequate reason for choosing a certain text for a certain Sunday, and sometimes no theme seems to be fitted into our personal mood, or the state of affairs among our people. We come to Sunday night after preaching, and find ourselves utterly bankrupt, and yet know when the week is out we must have chosen and elaborated themes which shall edify the people at their two services the following Sunday, to say nothing of the varied labors which we have to perform in prayer, social reform, charitable and other services held during the week. It is a relief to lie down to rest with the thought that as soon as you have recovered from Sunday, you can go directly forward in the line of your last week's study, and have all the momentum which you have secured in the past to help you now. You are like the boat steaming down river: you simply stop to discharge freight and passengers; the fire does not go out; put on a little more coal, loosen the hawser, and off you go until another landing must be made. What is the best of all in this matter, if one has to prepare for two services, is, he will find that the first of the week spent in faithful study of

the Scriptures will have given him mental and spiritual stimulus that will make exceeding light the labor on the remaining discourse, and more than likely a sermon full grown, may spring from this fruitful toil. For there is nothing so stimulating or suggestive as the careful, patient, scholarly, devout study of God's Word.

On the whole, therefore, brethren and fathers, we do well to continue, or if we have not already taken it up, to adopt the practice of expounding more systematically the Word of God in our pulpits. For our sake as Christian scholars, for our people's sake as needing to be fed with the Word of God, we can use no instrumentality which will do more to broaden our ministry and make it effectual in saving souls, and, what is even better than this, building them up into the likeness of our Lord.

J. G. MERRILL.

SCIENCE AND REVELATION.

THE Bible, as a revelation from God, must be wonderful and true. Some of its wonders are discoverable by the most casual reader, but not all, by far. Science, in its onward march, is constantly adding new wonders, and bringing more fully into light its great wonder of truthfulness. The Bible is its own defense. It does not stand in need of anything external to itself to establish its truthfulness. What God would reveal must be true, as there could be no possible motive to induce him to falsehood; and could he have yielded to such a motive he would have ceased to be God. "It is impossible for God to lie." Every careful and honest reader accepts the conclusion of David when he says (Ps. cxix. 160): "Thy word is true from the beginning." "Thy word is truth," is the laconic but forcible utterance of him who spake as "never man spake," and "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" (Col. ii. 3).

Science, defined in accordance with the etymology of the term, is, that which is known. It is *truth ascertained*; and not conjectures based on so-called scientific deductions. Science is knowlege, classified, philosophical, profound, complete, *true*. Sir W. Hamilton says, "Science . . . is a complement of cognitions, having, in point of form, the character of *logical perfection*, and, in point of matter, the character, of *real truth*." Revelation, then, is true and science, also is true; therefore they must agree with each other. This agreement is what we are now to

consider. In its consideration the reader must remember that conjecture and visionary theories are not in the domain of science; and that we can accept as science, only ascertained truth; that which is *known*, not *guessed at*.

I. Let us consider the science of geology. We must first determine what are the established truths of this science. What may the geologist *know*? Men have read, from the fossil leaflets, of the foundations of our earth. Their success has been great; and thier elevation thereat, and the self-confidence which it has inspired in them, has prompted them to go beyond the rocky records of earth's strata into the mazes of human speculation and unwarrantable deductions. These speculations and deductions are presented as the teachings of geology, and as such they are accepted by some of those who permit others to do their thinking. The great truth which geology reveals is the order of events in the creation. It also brings to light something of the character of life—animal and vegetable—of the different periods. Men have attempted to measure time by geological records, but their efforts have been futile; failure and ridicule have been their reward. It remains, then, for us to determine whether this order of events agree, with the order given in the first chapter of Genesis. Of course all will admit that there was a pre-geologic time in the history of creation. The events of the first and second "days" are such as have no relation to geology. Our comparison, then, must begin with the events of the third day.

1. The events of this "day" are as follows (See Gen. I. 9-13): (1) the appearance of the dry land, and (2) the beginning of vegetable life. The first of the geologic period or times, called the azoic (from *a*,

without, and *zoe*, life), according to the wisest geologists, witnessed the appearance of the continents and the beginnings of life.

2. The events of the fourth "day" were the creation of the sun, moon and stars, which of course have no direct relation to the science of geology. Still we may yield to them the position of potent agencies in the production of the dense and massive vegetation of the carboniferous age which followed.

3. The fifth "day" of Genesis witnessed the creation of fishes, birds, and "great whales," or reptiles. The paleozoic (*palaio*s, ancient, and *zoe*, life) and mesozoic (*mesos*, middle, and *zoe*, life) times of geologic history witness the same things. Moreover, the exact order of Genesis in presenting the events of these "days" of revelation is followed by science in presenting the events of these geologic "times." (1) Genesis says that the waters brought forth "abundantly the moving creature that hath life." This teaches conclusively that aquatic life was the first. Throughout the whole paleozoic time of geology this species of life predominated. The silurian age, first of the paleozoic time, found the waters swarming with life, principally mollusks, so that the age is also called the age of mollusks. In the second age, the devonian, fishes in such vast numbers were added that it is called the age of fishes. In the third and last age, the carboniferous, reptile life began. (2) According to Genesis the creation of birds, "fowl that may fly above the earth," followed the creation of fishes. In the mesozoic time, which immediately followed the paleozoic, birds as well as reptiles were numerous. In ~~dee~~ some geologists are of the opinion that for a greater part of this period bird life was dominant upon the earth.

4. The sixth "day" of Genesis finds the earth the dwelling place of living creatures,—“cattle, creeping things and beasts of the earth.” Geology teaches that in the next period of creative process, viz., the cenozoic (*kainos*, recent, and *zoe*, life) time, mammals came forth in great numbers and of large size; and, as the era advanced, they so increased in variety as to even exceed the mammalia of the present time. Thus passed a portion of the sixth day; the remainder of it witnessed the appearance of man,—the crowning piece of creative power and skill. Genesis plainly teaches that man was the last creature formed. The rest which the Creator declared after man's creation has never been broken. Science utterly fails to present a form of life of more recent origin than man. Although they have sought it with great care and earnestness, that they might establish their favorite theories, such men as Huxley and Tyndall acknowledge the absolute want of all evidence that a newer form of life than the human exists in nature.

From the foregoing it will be seen that there is no disagreement nor the shadow of discrepancy between Genesis and the science of geology. The exact order of events throughout the whole creative period is presented by both science and revelation. Then the science of zoology adds its testimony, substantiating the idea of revelation that the work of creation terminated with man.

But does some one ask, “What are we to understand by the “*days*” of Genesis? We are to understand simply *time*, a measured portion of duration; but of the extent of that duration we know nothing, and can know nothing definitely. The conclusion of the most profound Biblical scholars of the world in regard to these

"days," is the conclusion of the geologists who have given the known in regard to the duration of the geologic times, and is this: "*The time is long.*" That they were not similar to our days is certain from the fact that our means of measuring time were not created until the fourth day after this order and kind of "days" was instituted. "Of the times and seasons," says Paul, "ye have no need that I write unto you;" and the same idea of inspiration seems to have possessed Moses. It would seem that the first vision presented to him by the Creator was the scene presented by the newly created matter from which the universe was to be built, as it lay out before its Author, diffused, gaseous, unorganized and seemingly useless. Then he wrote, "God created the heaven and the earth." He looks again; his former vision has passed away, and another greets his eyes. A lesser scene, probably, yet full of grandeur and of the glory and power of God. From the vast universe of matter his gaze is now directed to the matter of our own little sphere. He sees it formless, void, and enveloped in the thick darkness of a sunless, starless universe, yet the Spirit of God was there, superintending, guiding, directing all its movements. Now he writes, "The earth was without form and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." He makes no reference to the length of the interval of time between these events and those of his former vision, because it was not revealed to him. It was not necessary for him, nor is it for us, to know this. The same may be said of the intervals between the events of his subsequent visions. The Creator showed him the massive structure, piece by piece, in their regular order, but the time and manner of con-

struction he did not reveal. Just this, and no more, may the geologist know. And if we will prune Genesis of all false interpretations, and geology of its conjectures, we will find that the geologist's knowledge and Moses' revelation exactly coincide.

II. We may now notice some of the bold statements of some of the facts of science which may be found in revelation. These become very important when we consider that they were made without any support in the general knowledge or phraseology of the time in which they were written, but have been confirmed by discoveries made thousands of years afterwards. In noticing these statements we may go through the whole roll of the sciences and find some truths of every one stated in revelation. Such a course would require too much space and time for our present purpose. A few will suffice. There are many statements of geological truth found in the Bible, but as considerable has already been said on that subject, we will pass them to notice others.

1. In zoology. Read in Prov. VI. 6-8 and xxx. 25, of the provident character of the ant, and then read Col. Sykes' account of that species of ant (*Atta Providens*) which "regularly stores up the seed of millet for its food in stormy weather." Read also of the "agricultural" ants of Texas, which have a tiny farm and cultivate a plant (*Aristida stricta*) whose seed they harvest and store away for future use. How strikingly true does the word of revelation appear! Again read in Job xxxix. 13-16 and Lam. iv. 3, of the cruel carelessness of the ostrich, in leaving her nest and young ones, and then the statement of a modern naturalist that "the ostrich quits her nest during the day, and abandons it altogether if there has been any intru-

sion made upon it." The traits and characteristics of the conies, the dog, the horse, and many others, are expressly alluded to in revelation, and its allusions are fully corroborated by the science of zoology. This science also teaches man's superiority and lordship over nature, which is so plainly taught in Gen. i. 28, where he is commanded to replenish and *subdue* the earth, and to *have dominion* over the fish of the sea, the fowl of the air, and everything that moveth upon the earth.

2. In physical geography. (1) Revelation speaks with reference to our winds. "The wind goeth toward the south and turneth about unto the north; it whirleth about continually, and the wind returneth again according to his circuits" (Eccl. i. 6). How admirably this accords with the scientific statement of the rush of winds toward the equator, and their rising in the great heated current there, and, when cooled, hasting back to whence they came! Both science and revelation give this as the established course, the "circuit" of the winds. While referring to the winds, which are only air in motion, we may speak of the ponderable nature of the air. When Torricelli discovered and announced that the air had weight, it was received with great incredulity. Yet the truth is simply and easily demonstrated by weighing a hollow globe filled with air, and then extracting the air and weighing the globe. The difference between the two weights is the weight of the inclosed air. This truth was unmistakably taught in the very earliest utterances of revelation, nearly 3,500 years ago. Job says God made "weight for the winds" (Job xxviii. 25). Thus we see revelation teaching of the character and direction of the wind currents, accounting for their wonderful momentum—for weight is necessary to give momentum—and proclaim-

ing, thousands of years before man comprehended the truth, that air is not imponderable. (2) It speaks of rains, rivers, and the sea, in this language: "All the rivers run into the sea, yet the sea is not full; *unto the place whence the rivers come*, thither they return again" (Eccl. I. 7). "He calleth for the waters of the sea, and poureth them out upon the face of the earth" (Amos. ix. 6). A more succinct and truthful explanation of the phenomena of rain, unfailing sources of rivers, and the unfilled sea, can not be found. Science teaches how the waters are lifted from the sea by evaporation and carried by the winds over the land, and there poured out in rain to refresh our fields and replenish the subterranean reservoirs, whence our water courses receive their supply. Had the men of olden time been as ready to "commit their way unto the Lord," and to consult his Word, as they were to "lean to their own understanding," they would not have groped so long in darkness, nor given to the world so many absurd theories in reference to these things. (3) It also teaches of the heated condition and the pent-up forces of the earth's interior, as the "furnace of earth." Here again do science and revelation agree. We may see evidence of the truthfulness of their statements in many places; and, if we grow forgetful, the occasional rumble of the earthquake and the smoking volcano remind us of the scientific and revealed fact.

3. In astronomy. Here we find so much that may be said that by far the greater part must be left unsaid. A few facts are enough. (1) The phenomena of sunrise and sunset. Revelation declares: "The sun also ariseth, and the sun goeth down" (Eccl. I. 5). Some pretended men of science have ridiculed that ex-

pression as unscientific and false. But they did not know enough when they would correct the expression of him who placed the sun in the midst of the heavens, and gave it all its forces and movements. Recent astronomers proclaim that the sun moves around the earth as much as the earth around the sun. The fact is that both bodies revolve around the centre of gravity of both, so that it may truly be said that the sun rises and goes down. This "rising and setting," however, does not cause day and night. It is not this phenomenon to which the text above quoted refers. God is here stating the fact that the sun is governed by the same laws which control the earth and other planets. But if reference were had to the phenomenon of day and night, no ridicule can attach to the writer, for, as a poet, he had the right to use the unscientific phraseology of his time. In regard, however, to day and night—the dayspring—revelation gives no uncertain nor unscientific sound. It teaches that the earth is *turned to it*, "as clay to the seal" (Job xxxviii. 12, 14). The axial motion of the earth is here plainly taught. All honor to Copernicus for his great discovery; but all glory, majesty and power to him who, thirty-four centuries ago, revealed the same great truth. (2) The spheroidal form of the earth. The expression, "the ends of the earth," has been much criticised by would-be scientists. Is it not a little strange that men of such penetrating acumen would never discover that revelation never uses that expression in reference to the *shape* of the earth? Is it not again strange that as scientists, seekers after that which may be known, they should never have found this in revelation referring to the Creator: "It is he that sitteth upon the circle (sphere, as per Genesis) of the

earth" (Is. XL. 22). This statement, made when men taught that the earth was flat and that the god's had stationed along the border headless men, goblins, hideous and ferocious monsters to keep men from going too far, and when no one believed in the rotundity of the earth, is now a fully established fact of science. There is no clash or disagreement here. (3) The suspended condition of the earth in space. While men were building, in their imaginations, those wonderful pillars of elephants, tortoises, serpents and frogs, for the support of the earth, and for long ages before, revelation was patiently teaching that God "hangeeth the earth upon nothing" (Job XXVI. 7). How true is this? How slow men have been to apprehend the truth! (4) The number of stars. Revelation declares that "the host of heaven cannot be numbered" (Jer. XXXIII. 22). Although there are several ancient catalogues of the stars, they are all now discarded, and astronomers acknowledge that the starry host is absolutely beyond counting. It is God alone who "telleteth the number of the stars" (Ps. CXLVII. 4). (5) The distance of the stars from the earth. Paradoxical as it may seem, it is, nevertheless, true that we never see the stars. So far away are they that the most powerful telescope fails to reveal a sensible disk. The nearest of the fixed stars is *alpha centauri*; yet its distance from the earth is so great that light, which travels at the astonishing rapidity of 185,500 miles in a second, must travel three years and nine months to span the intervening space. To express this distance in mile would be to express that which is incomprehensible. But when we say the sun is 92,500,000 miles from the earth, and that *alpha centauri* is 226,000 times as far away, we may approach unto an idea of

the distance. The next nearest star is 61 Cygni, which is twice as far away. Then comes Sirius, that bright star so well known to all students and observers of the stars, which is twice as far away as 61 Cygni. The North Star (*polaris*) is so far away that light must travel constantly for *forty-five years* to reach us from that far-away "light-house of the skies." With these established truths of science before us we may understand the feelings of Job when, as God revealed to him the same truths, he exclaimed: "Behold the height of the stars, how high they are" (Job xxii. 12). These statements are certainly sufficient to satisfy all of the harmony of revelation and astronomy.

From the preceding statements of the truths of various sciences and of revelation we must see how nearly to prophetic ken Lowell approached when he wrote:

"Science was Faith once; Faith were science now."

Surely enough has been said to satisfy every reasonable mind that true science has given to the world nothing that can shake its faith in the revealed Word. Yea, more; the onward march of science has been but little less than an absolute demonstration—in many cases unwittingly made—of the positive enunciation of revelation. In the light of true science, and true culture, we may have the same strong confidence in God's Word that David had when he said: "Thy testimonies are very sure." "Thy Word is true from the beginning." And we may add, also, our meed of testimony in the words of Peter: "All flesh is as the grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of the grass. The grass withereth and the flower thereof falleth away; *but the word of the Lord endureth forever.*"

A few more thoughts and I close this paper, already, perhaps, too long. Long years ago Lord Bacon gave

to the world the true scientific way to knowledge, viz: the way of experiment and trial. The Bible does not ask men to leave this way in their coming to the knowledge of God—which knowledge is life eternal to all who attain unto it. God is a reasonable being. He has made man like himself, and now says to him: “Come now, let us reason together.” What marvelous condescension, that he who is higher than the heavens, and whose understanding is infinite, should consent to reason with finite and ephemeral man! Yet such is the case, and his reasoning is full of tenderness and love, and its logic is simply irresistible. But he does not seek to reclaim man by the mere force of reason. When this has done its full work, he says, “Taste and see that the Lord is good.” “Prove me now.” Try me and know that my word is true. The Savior says: “If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine.” Thus we see that Bacon’s plan was, in reality, but the acceptance of the Bible plan. Men of science observe a fact, or a combination of facts, which awaken thought, or give it new direction. Thoughts develop into a theory; and then they go to work in faith to see if all facts will sustain that theory. Such is God’s plan for us to obtain that knowledge which shall be unto salvation; more than in his plan the facts, the theory and the Spirit to “guide us into all truth” are given, and only our faith, with its work and labor of love, is necessary to perfect demonstration.

The faith of science is wonderful. There is not one of the sciences that does not require a greater stretch of credulity than God requires for the salvation of a soul. Who *knows* that there are atoms? that there is an ethereal substance beyond our atmosphere?

that gases are made of particles? or that the earth has poles? Absolutely no one; yet these ideas are accepted, unhesitatingly, by the world as scientific truths. They, with many other physically undemonstrable things, are the *faiths of science*; yet these faiths have almost led to seeing. So the Christian's faith shall triumph. "Now we see through a glass darkly," but we *shall* see "face to face." Although it is now "given unto us to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God," we "know only in part;" but we "shall know hereafter;" and that knowledge shall be as perfect as that by which we are known. It is a very false idea that a man must be unscientific in order to be religious.

The science of zoology teaches that one form or character of life is prophetic of another and higher form. Man is the latest form of life. We find in him much that is prophetic. In his longing for strength we read the prophecy of that state wherein he shall be like him unto whom "all power in heaven and earth is given." In the yearning of his soul for the beautiful, we have the telescope which reveals to us the heavenly city and home, "the perfection of beauty." In his constant battle with sin, darkness, disease and death, we are led to hope with that hope which, in the strength of God's Word, is "both sure and steadfast," for the "new heavens and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness," where

"Sickness, sorrow, pain and death
Are felt and feared no more."

What the teachings of science would thus lead us to infer the Bible unequivocally declares. Science seeks an adequate cause for every effect. One instance of its efforts in this direction resulted in the discovery of a world, and nearly a doubling of the realm of our sun.

For a time the planet Uranus was accelerated in its orbit and then again was retarded. Science said there must be an attracting world beyond. It determined then by computation the position and approximate size of that world, then looked, *and saw it*. For centuries now the world has been the witness of a mighty effect. Has it carefully considered and fully determined the cause? Men have been found with a purpose, wholly unselfish, yet so strong that all the perils of shipwreck, the blood-thirstiness of the beasts of Ephesus, and the horrors of a Roman dungeon could not bend it. Others, with a courage and boldness in the defense of truth that would defy the legions of popery, and fearlessly hold aloft the banner of truth and righteousness even in the presence of devils as numerous as the tiles on the houses. Others, with a devotion to principle so pure and unyielding that the tortures of the Inquisition and the flames of martyrdom could only make it brighter and more enduring. Others, of more modern times, and places not so far away, with a love for the Master's service which the world, with all its allurements of pleasure, wealth, fame and honor cannot move. Shall we not, from these effects, infer an attracting power above and beyond this world? What we may thus infer the Bible pointedly states. A hope is set before us—an anchor which holds within the veil. The attracting force is God and heaven, that "far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory."

Science teaches "survival of the fittest." And, as we look into the past, we find evidence of the truthfulness of the theory. Revelation teaches of the same thing; and of the future its teachings are unmistakable—*the fittest shall survive*. The fittest qualities in society are love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness

goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, for against such there is and can be no law. Their fittest nature appears when we consider their opposites, viz.: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like. These fittest survive. No matter how far man may have fallen in degradation and wretchedness, there remains to the very last a cord within his heart that will vibrate at the touch of these graces, though it may be so muffled and smothered that we often fail to notice it. Let the dark cloud of utter faithlessness rest upon society; let even a reign of terror come, such as once came to France, so that murder and arson shall be rife, the streets be drenched in blood, and cries of anguish torture every hour; yet when the fiend shall have been stayed, then shall spring up from the dreary ruin in all serenity and purity the peaceful and pleasant fruits of love and faith. *The fittest shall survive.*

Finally, when the Lord shall come to judge the world, and every man's work shall be tried, that which shall be of these fittest materials, founded upon Christ, the eternal Rock, shall survive. And in the subsequent wreck of matter and desolation and anguish of the unsaved, those who have cultivated and used these fittest qualities shall be caught up to meet the Lord in the air, and so be ever with him, kings and priests unto God forever. *The fittest survive.* Science and revelation speak but one voice; they teach the same truths. Will you accept and be proud of the one, and reject the other, simply because that other, in addition to the truths they teach in common, pointedly declares the unpleasant truth of your own sinfulness? Certainly

such a course would be unreasonable when we consider the simple and effective means which that other reveals for the cure of sinfulness. There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ.

B. F. WHITTEMORE.

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT UNDER THE OLD TESTAMENT DISPENSATION.

CHAPTER II.

Search the Scriptures.—*John v. 39.*

IF any one will diligently search he will find many passages of the Scriptures which bear testimony to the Spirit's work in the hearts of the people under the Old Testament dispensation. Some of them are discussed in this chapter.

STRIVING OF THE SPIRIT.

I. Gen. vi. 3.—“And the Lord said, My Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be a hundred and twenty years.” The common interpretation of this passage applies the “one hundred and twenty years” to the length of human life, and teaches that man, after that time, was not to live longer than the hundred and twenty years. This is evidently incorrect.* In the eleventh chapter of this book is a long list of names of men who lived from two hundred to five hundred years. Indeed, at no time, ancient or modern, has the one hundred and twenty years been the average length of human life. If that had been the intent of the declaration, the record of deaths which took place afterward would doubtless have shown that men died about that age. It is, however, far otherwise. Let us seek for another meaning. The matters mentioned in connection with the passage will aid in a correct interpretation. These are:

1. The matrimonial alliance between “the sons of

*Lange, in loco.

God" and "the daughters of men." Two parties, somewhat different as to their religious character, already existed on the earth. One party were Cainites, and were called *children of men*, because they did not worship God, but were exceedingly wicked and walked according to the desire of their own hearts. The other party were Sethites, and were called the *sons of God*, because they kept up the worship of the true God. In the lapse of time it came to pass that the sons of God, or children of the Church, were drawn into unholy alliances with the children of the world. These marriages, as such have nearly always done, resulted not in the moral elevation of the worse party, but in the degradation of the latter.

2. The Cainites gained the ascendancy in numbers and influence; and, having no fear of God, nor respect for the interest of man, in their hearts, they became giants in wickedness. When this corrupt party had absorbed all the race, except Noah and his family, and "the wickedness of men was great in the earth," then the Lord said, "I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth." This last declaration is closely connected with the text—"My Spirit shall not always strive with man." They were both uttered about the same time, and both were spoken in view of the prevailing wickedness of the people. When the striving of the Spirit, which is declared in the first, should cease, then the destruction spoken of in the second would take place.

3. The reason assigned for the cessation of the Spirit's influence with man, was: "For that he also is flesh." "Man," in this passage, means the human family as then existing, Noah and his family excepted. To say that man was "flesh," does not mean simply

that he was made of flesh and blood. But *flesh* is used here somewhat as St. Paul uses* it, viz.: to represent depraved nature. The family of man, then, was desperately wicked. They were resisting the Spirit and following greedily the lusts of the flesh. The Spirit and the flesh are antagonistic. Man in his nature and habits was altogether of the flesh, and therefore he resisted the Spirit. In the twelfth and thirteenth verses, the word flesh is used as synonymous with man. Noah was a "preacher of righteousness." When he began to preach, or how long he had preached before the utterance of the text, the record does not say. It was about one hundred years from the time he received instruction to build the ark until the flood came. During this time, doubtless, he preached much to his neighbors, and the Spirit strove with them. The Spirit had been striving with man (the whole race) before this time. Let us suppose that for twenty years before special means of grace had been used, and these all had been slighted by man. Count these twenty years with the hundred intervening between the time of the text and the coming of the flood, and the sum will be one hundred and twenty. If this count of time be correct, the meaning of the passage will be clear. "My Spirit shall not always strive with man . . . yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years," will then mean that the destruction of the race would not be accomplished until the expiration of the appointed period. That was the time given for their probation. The Spirit had been striving with them, and, along with the preaching of Noah, would continue to strive until the hundred and twenty years had ended. Then, when that period should have elapsed, the Spirit would cease to strive, take its flight and give up the race of man,

Noah and family excepted, to the curse—temporal destruction and eternal perdition.

So it was that Cain, the first-born after the flesh, was also the first to stain his hands with a brother's blood. The depravity of fallen man developed fully in him. Despising instruction and the moving of the Spirit, he sought to have the law of religious offering conform to his own convenience. He was rejected, and became envious of his successful brother. Envy grew into hate, hate into wrath, and wrath spent itself in murder. His war upon Abel was that of the evil upon the good, the flesh against the Spirit. His family and party were like him. They increased in numbers and in crime until God overthrew them all.

On the other hand, Abel, the first among the children of man to be born of the Spirit, made an acceptable offering to the Lord, became the first martyr to religion, and was the first redeemed soul conducted by angels into glory.

Seth was born, and became successor to Abel. In his house the Church of God was honored. From him, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, the Church passed to Enoch and Methuselah and Lamech, and with Noah in the Ark it rode over the flood; then passed to Abraham and to David, and onward through the generations until Christ, the Lamb of God, was slain. Then came in full the dispensation of the Spirit; Zion arose and put on her beautiful garments; broke down the circumscribing walls, extended her borders, and shed her light over the world's great empires, and she will continue to extend until the whole earth shall be filled with her glory.

REVIVAL OF RELIGION.

II. , 'Then began men to call upon the name of the

the Lord" (Gen. iv. 26.) This was in the days of Enos, who was born two hundred and thirty-five years after the creation of Adam. He was the son of Seth, and helped to keep up the true religion. In his time, men began to call upon the name of the Lord. Men had called upon the Lord before. Abel had been an earnest worshipper of God. Seth also, if no others, was accustomed to religious service. How is it, then, that men began "to call upon the name of the Lord" in the days of Enos? Evidently this was more of a public and general character; when all except Cain's family were interested in religious work.

But men do not of themselves become zealous of good works, and diligent in seeking and promoting the truth; unaided human nature does not seek to hold communion with God and to be subject to his laws. This calling upon the name of the Lord by men at that time must have been induced by the Holy Spirit; that is, there was a genuine revival of religion. It was the first revival, and was produced by an out-pouring of the Holy Ghost upon the hearts of the people, to enable them to lay hold of Christ as Redeemer, who was dimly presented to their minds in their animal sacrifices.

The mediatorial work of Christ began immediately after the fall of man. So soon as man came under the curse of death, life was offered to him through the Mediator, and the Holy Spirit was the agent in effecting reconciliation and in inducing man to accept that life.

Under the Mosaic dispensation there were many seasons of prosperity and adversity, and occasions of joy and sorrow. Notably among these may be mentioned that of the joyous song recorded in the fifteenth chapter of Exodus, in which Moses and others uttered

praise and gratitude, and pledges of fidelity to God for his wonderful mercy toward them; and also that of the sadness, and repentance, and turning unto the Lord, which occurred in the land of the Chaldees when Israel sat down by the rivers of Babylon and wept.

In the present state of things, such exercises of soul are usually attributed to the influence of the Holy Spirit. What kind of logic shall hinder us from attributing them in former times to the same cause? On this point, *Edwards' History of Redemption*, p. 41, has the following paragraph: "It may here be observed that from the fall of man to our day the work of redemption in its effects has mainly been carried on by remarkable out-pourings of the Spirit of God. Though there be a more constant influence of God's Spirit always in some degree attending his ordinances, yet the way in which the greatest things have been done towards carrying on this work has always been by remarkable effusions at special seasons of mercy, as may fully appear in our further prosecution of the subject. And this in the days of Enos was the first remarkable out-pouring of the Spirit recorded. There had been a saving work of God in the hearts of some before; but now God was pleased to bring in a harvest of souls to Christ; so that in this we see that great building, of which God laid the foundation immediately after the fall, carried on further, and built higher, than it had been before."

III. Three remarkable instances of divine presence are recorded in the Bible.

1. Ex. xl. 34-35: "Then a cloud covered the tent of the congregation, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle. And Moses was not able to enter into the tent of the congregation, because the cloud abode

thereon, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle." This occurred about fifteen hundred years before Christ, when Moses had completed and set up the tabernacle, altar, and court, "as the Lord commanded him."

2. I Kings VIII. 10, 11: "And it came to pass when the priest had come out of the holy place, that the cloud filled the house of the Lord, so that the priests could not stand to minister because of the cloud, for the glory of the Lord had filled the house of the Lord." This took place about one thousand years before Christ, in the great temple at Jerusalem, when every thing had been made ready and properly placed, and Solomon had "assembled the elders of Israel, and all the heads of the tribes, the chief of the fathers of the children of Israel," to attend to all things necessary for the dedication of the temple.

3. Acts II. 2-4. "And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." This came to pass at Jerusalem, fifty days after the resurrection of Christ.

A striking similarity exists in the three cases. In the first and second, it is said that the "glory of the Lord filled the house." In the third, it is stated that the apostles, and all the house where they were sitting, were filled with the Holy Ghost. In the case of the tabernacle and that of the temple, the filling of the house by the glory of the Lord indicated an acceptance on his part of those buildings for his service, and as the especial places of his abode. It was his part of the

ceremony of dedication. On the day of Pentecost, the apostles and others were in one place, and for about ten days had been engaged "in prayer and supplication," by which they showed their confidence in their risen Lord. The Holy Ghost came upon them and filled not only the house, as had been done before, but also the apostles themselves; thereby accepting them for his service and dedicating them and the other disciples as his dwelling place. The most holy place in the tabernacle had been destroyed; that in the temple was soon to share a similar fate, and now the time had come "when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father;" but when God would make his presence known in the living temple, composed of all his worshippers. The import and manifestations of the divine presence and glory in these three cases have characteristics so similar that they all may reasonably be referred to the same cause.

St. Luke plainly states in his report of the Pentecostal occasion, that the Holy Spirit was the divine person there present; and, therefore, the conclusion is reasonable that he was the one present on the other occasions. His presence on all these occasions indicated one part of his work in the great plan of redemption; that is, to sanctify and inhabit God's earthly temple. Indeed, the Shekinah that rested on the mercy seat, under the outstretched wings of cherubim, finds its counterpart, essentially at least, in the tongues of fire on the heads of the apostles.

IV. The miraculous support of Israel in the wilderness. In the sixteenth chapter of Exodus is recorded an account of the manna upon which Israel fed, and in the next chapter is a statement about the water which they drank. Referring to the manna the Savior (John

vi. 32-35) says: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven. For the bread of God is he that cometh down from heaven, and giveth light unto the world." "Then said they unto him, Lord, evermore give us this bread. And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life." In John vii. 37, referring to water, he says: "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink." St. Paul, in I Corinthians x. 3, 4, speaking of the experience of "our fathers," says: "And (they) did all eat the same spiritual meat: and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ." The Lord is often spoken of in the Scriptures as a rock. Psalm xviii. 2: "The Lord is my rock." Matt. xvi. 18, he is called a rock, as the foundation of the Church; Luke xx. 17, the chief corner-stone. St. Paul calls Christ the "spiritual Rock that followed the Israelites on their journey." Of course he does not mean that Christ was literally the rock in Horeb, from which water miraculously flowed, nor does he mean that the rock literally followed them. Evidently he intends to teach that the rock in Horeb was typical of Christ; and as that rock was the source whence water flowed to maintain the temporal life of all [Israel, so Christ is the source whence issues spiritual life to his true Israel. But that rock "followed them;" that is, the water that came from the rock, following the natural descent of the country, flowed off in the direction of Israel's journeyings, and throughout nearly the entire period of their sojourn in the wilderness, they drank of this stream from Horeb,—“the brook that descended out of the mount.” The manna is called *spiritual meat*,

and the water *spiritual drink*; and both were typical of Christ. These necessities of life were constantly supplied according to daily demand. So all who are Christ's in the wilderness of this world must draw their spiritual life, their meat and drink, from him. And he also goes with his people on their journey; for he said, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Again he says, "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever." The Savior certainly did not want his disciples to understand that he, in person, as he then was, would be with them always, but that he by the Spirit would abide with them. The life that was in him was the source of life to his followers, but it must be inspired in the hearts of his people by the Spirit of life. Christ was, and is, "spiritual meat" and "spiritual drink," but these are supplied to his people by the ever-abiding Spirit. Christ is the original source of the stream of life, but the Spirit is the efficient agent in drawing man into a participation of that life. The Rock, therefore, with its stream of water flowing through the desert, was a beautiful symbol of Christ with his ever-present Spirit giving joy and gladness to his people through the desert of this world. And as there is but one Savior and but one Spirit, all that are his, that have been his, or that ever will be his, must have come, or will come, to the Savior by the Spirit. Symbol and the thing symbolized both may exist at the same time, and difference in time does not change the essential features of the plan of redemption.

The following points of instruction are quoted from *Fairbairn's Typology*, pp. 73, 74:

1. "Christ ministers to his people abundance of spir-

itual refreshment, while they are on their way to the heavenly inheritance. They need this to carry them onward through the trials and difficulties that lie in their way; and He is ever ready to impart it. 'If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink.' What He then did in the region of the bodily life, He cannot but be disposed to do over again in the higher regions of the spiritual life; for there the necessity is equally great and the interests involved are unspeakably greater. Let the believer, when parched in spirit and feeling in heaviness, through manifold temptations, throw himself back upon this portion of Israel's history, and he will see written, as with a sunbeam, the assurance, that the Savior of Israel, who fainteth not, nor is weary, will satisfy the longing soul, and pour living water upon him that is thirsty.

2. "In providing and ministering this refreshment He will break through the greatest hindrances and impediments. If His people but thirst, nothing can prevent them from being partakers of the blessing. 'He makes for them rivers in the desert;' the very rock turns into a flowing stream; and the valley of Baca (weeping) is found to contain its pools of refreshment, at which the travelers to Zion revive their flagging spirits, and go from strength to strength. How often have the darkest providences, events that seemed before hard and pregnant only with evil, become, through the gracious presence of the Mediator, the source of the deepest joy and consolation!

3. "'The rock by its waters accompanied the Israelites—so Christ by his Spirit goes with His disciples even to the end of the world.' The refreshments of His grace are confined to no region, and last through all ages. Wherever the genuine believer is, there they also

are. And more highly favored than even Israel in the wilderness. He has them in his own bosom—He has there a well of water springing up into life everlasting.”

V. SPECIAL INSTANCES OF THE SPIRIT'S WORK.

1. Adam. No certainty can be reached in this case. Probability, however, is on the side of Adam's reconciliation and acceptance. The history is very meagre, but enough is given to afford some ground of hope. The fact of his sin was alarming to himself, as well as full of sadness to his race. His expulsion from Paradise would have been overwhelming to him had there not been something to which he could cling in hope. Two things occurred in the experience of Adam and his wife which show that they were not insensible of the situation. In the first place, they were ashamed of themselves, and sought to cover their nakedness; in the next place, they were now afraid of the Lord in whom they had before taken delight. “I was afraid, because I was naked, and I hid myself.” These matters of experience were exactly those of convicted sinners. Even at the present time a sinner under conviction often tries to cover himself with his own righteousness, but he fails as completely as did Adam and Eve when they tried to cover their nakedness with fig leaves. The promise of the seed of the woman, and of the success of that seed in bruising the serpent's head, contained some ground of hope to the guilty pair. But more encouraging still was the act of the Lord when he made “coats of skins and clothed them.” These skins were doubtless those of beasts slain in sacrifice, and the idea of the sacrifice certainly was explained to them; so that they understood their own inability to hide their shame, and received the covering with which

the Lord clothed them. And that was typical of the righteousness of Christ with which all who accept life in him are clothed. It is reasonable to suppose that Adam, knowing good and evil as he then did, convicted in his heart by the Spirit of God, and alarmed at the consequences of his disobedience, gladly accepted deliverance from eternal death through the promised Redeemer. Animal sacrifice was instituted, the plan of salvation had begun to be revealed, the life of the promised deliverer was sufficient for all the race; and certainly Adam, induced by the Holy Spirit, would lay hold of the only means for regaining the lost paradise. At least let us hope that the father of the race, though wrecked and ruined by Satan, was rescued and restored by the Redeemer.

2. In the short history of man before the flood, there is recorded a considerable list of names of men who, amid the desperate wickedness of those times, held to the worship of the true God. Abel and Noah, as the first and last of these, may be taken as fair representatives of this class; and one of those was "righteous," the other was "a preacher of righteousness." By what means or agency could men become righteous except by the influence of the Holy Spirit? All these had been convicted by the same Spirit that now convinces "the world of sin;" they were converted by the same Spirit that caused such amazement in the day of Pentecost; and they were enabled to resist the tempter, to grow in grace, and to walk in righteousness, by the same Spirit that inspired the apostles and sustained them in their work. Under the Christian dispensation, Saint Stephen is called the first martyr, and the second history states that he was "full of the Holy Ghost." Nearly four thousand years before his time, Abel had

died a martyr for the true religion, and he, doubtless, was prepared for that event by the same Spirit that caused Stephen's face to appear "as it had been the face of an angel."

3. The Old Testament contains accounts of two men who were remarkable for holiness of character, as well as for the particular favor shown to them by the Lord; one of these, Enoch, lived before the flood, and of him it is written: "And Enoch walked with God, and he was not; for God took him" (Gen. v. 24). St. Paul, also, Heb. XI. 5, says: "By faith Enoch was translated, that he should not see death."

The other one lived more than two thousand years after Enoch, and it is said of him that on a certain occasion "there appeared a chariot of fire, and horses of fire, and parted them both asunder; and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven." These two men possessed personal holiness in a high degree. Moral purity would certainly be required of him who "walked with God." A "chariot of fire" drawn by "horses of fire," would not be sent from heaven to translate an ordinary man. In their work they pleased God; and by the assisting grace and purifying power of the Holy Ghost they had obtained the mastery over sin. With them, religion was a living reality. Both soul and body were made holy to the Lord, were brought into subjection to his law, and into perfect harmony with his will. Translation from earth to heaven was a wonderful distinction. Of all the race, only these two have thus been honored. Under the Christian dispensation, with all its enlarged privileges and increased spiritual power, no one has been permitted to pass from earth, except through the dark valley and shadow of death. But the Holy Spirit exercised such an

influence over Enoch and Elijah, that they were saved from the common doom of death. The insatiate grave never received their bodies within its dark, cold walls. They passed from earth, and were not found. God took them. Yea, in their pilgrimage to the Canaan of Rest, the Lord went with them; and when they had come near to the Jordan of death, he lifted them up and set them over the stream, so that not even their feet touched its chilly waters. Glorious instances are these of continuous life; and proof, incontestible of immortality.

4. Abraham, Samuel, all the prophets, and a host of others mentioned in the Old Testament history, proved by their life-work that they had communion with the Holy Spirit. Abraham, in the severe trial of faith which he endured; Samuel, in his official ministrations, and the prophets, in their declarations of future events, all were lifted above the nature of man, and by the Holy Ghost were enabled to do works to which human strength was wholly inadequate. No man unaided by the Spirit has ever been able to lift the veil of the future and reveal the things of coming time. St. Peter II. 21, bears testimony to the full inspiration of the prophets: "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

5. David, though a prophet and included in the number of those just mentioned, deserves especial consideration. He was a man, by nature, of strong passion and great intellectual vigor. Possessed of courageous spirit and unfaltering fidelity, he was well qualified to become the captain of Israel's hosts. In him the extremes of human life were brought together. He was a plain shepherd boy and a victorious king. He was

bold as a lion to meet in single combat Philistia's giant; and, yet, fled like a hunted hare from the envious Saul. His songs contain expressions of the deepest sorrow when affliction overwhelmed him, and of the greatest exultation when he had triumph over his foes. He sinned egregiously against God, yet most penitently sought forgiveness while he made full confession of his guilt. The Spirit of the Lord came upon David at the beginning of his public career. In I. Sam. xvi. 13, is this passage: "Then Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren: and the Spirit of the Lord came upon David from that day forward." The Holy Spirit, therefore, must be understood as remaining with David in his public life. The Holy Spirit inspires those soul-stirring psalms, so well adapted to the wants and feelings of Christians of all ages and in all conditions. The Holy Spirit directed him when he fled before his persecutors, as well as when he led the armies of Israel to victory. In all his varied fortune, in high and low degree, he was sensible of the Spirit's presence to guide, to restrain, and to rebuke. The fifty-first Psalm contains the earnest and honest expressions of his heart after his great sin. One passage is here quoted: "Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy Holy Spirit from me." David now was awake to the nature of his crime. His conscience was aroused, and the Holy Spirit intensified its action. As the Spirit had been with him before to guide and console, it was now with him to rebuke and convince him of sin. Some one may say that David was one of the inspired men, and for the purpose of that inspiration the Spirit was with him. But let it be remembered that in the passage just quoted, David is not speaking as an inspired prophet,

but as a man convicted of sin, crying out unto God for pardon, feeling the terrible reproof of the Holy Spirit, yet praying that it may remain with him. The Spirit was no comfort to him in that case, still he prayed "Take not thy Holy Spirit from me." What sense would there have been in that prayer, or what respect could men show to David's opinions, or thoughts, or prayers, if there had been no Holy Spirit in those days to convince of sin? If David is to be received as good authority on the subject, the Holy Spirit filled the same office, and performed the same kind of work then that it does under the Christian dispensation. If it be asked why the Spirit did not restrain David from sin and keep him perfect before the Lord, the answer is easy: The Holy Spirit, in all times, is to be regarded as the Divine Person, that warns, persuades, and draws, but never forces any man to any action. David simply resisted the influence of the Spirit, followed the blind impulse of passion, committed sin, and then the convicting power of the Spirit wrought on him so fearfully that he confessed his sin and begged for mercy. "My sin is ever before me," he cried. Yes, it was the Holy Spirit that held that sin in all its odiousness before his quickened conscience, and thus induced repentance and the plea for pardon.

Some will admit that the Spirit operated on certain persons to inspire them as leaders or prophets, but deny that there was any extended or general influence. The Scriptures, themselves, shall clear up this question:

First. Numbers xi. 24, 25: "And Moses went out, and told the people the words of the Lord, and gathered the seventy men of the elders of the people, and set them round about the tabernacle. And the Lord came down in a cloud, and spake unto him, and took of the

spirit that was upon him, gave it unto the seventy elders: and it came to pass, that, when the Spirit rested upon them, they prophesied and did not cease." Moses had complained that his burden was too heavy for him. "I am not able to bear all this people alone," said he, and called for help. The Lord granted his request and poured out his Spirit upon seventy elders of the people to qualify them to be assistants unto Moses.

This giving of the Spirit to them was to endue them with extraordinary power. By this they were enabled to *prophecy*; that is, to teach, instruct and exhort the people. Their appointment and their qualification were very similar to the appointment of the seventy evangelists by the Savior, and their complete qualification by the Spirit in the day of Pentecost. Under both dispensations therefore, for the performance of a special and similar work, the same number of men were appointed, and they were endowed by the same Spirit.

Second. Nehemiah ix. 18-20: "Yea, when they had made them a molten calf, and said, This is thy God that brought thee up out of Egypt, and had wrought great provocations; yet thou in thy manifold mercies forsookest them not in the wilderness: the pillar of the cloud departed not from them by day to lead them in the way; neither the pillar of fire by night, to show them light, and the way in which they should go. Thou gavest also thy good Spirit to instruct them, and withheldst not thy manna from their mouth, and gavest water for their thirst." Several things are here enumerated which pertained to Israel in the wilderness, namely: the molten calf, the pillar of the fire and cloud, the manna and the water. At the same time the Lord gave his "good Spirit to instruct them."

The period embraced in the passage extends from the beginning to the end of their journeying in the wilderness. The "good Spirit" was given, like the manna and the water, to all the people. It can no more be limited to Moses and the seventy elders, than the other things named in the passage. Light from the pillar of fire shone for all, the manna fell at every man's tent door, the water in the rippling brook flowed free for all, and surely the "good Spirit" given at the same time without restriction, must have been for all. Its work then was "to instruct them;" and so it works to-day.

Third. So Isaiah, speaking of Israel in "the days of old," LXIII. 10, says: "But they rebelled and vexed His Holy Spirit;" who was it that rebelled? was it the leaders or the people? surely the people rebelled; and the people "vexed his Holy Spirit." How could they vex the Spirit except by despising its warnings and refusing its guidance? And this could not have occurred unless the Spirit had been with the people.

Fourth. Haggai II. 5: "According to the word that I covenanted with you when ye came out of Egypt, so my Spirit remaineth among you, fear ye not." This prophecy dates about five hundred and twenty years before Christ. It is distinctly asserted that the Holy Spirit remained among the people, in accordance with a promise made when they came out of Egypt. Nearly a thousand years had elapsed, and still "My Spirit remaineth among you."

Fifth. A passage in the seventh chapter of the Acts of the Apostle shall close the list on this point. St. Stephen, when full of the Holy Ghost, said to the Jews, (verse 51,) "Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost:

as your fathers did, so do ye." Whom did St. Stephen mean by "your fathers?" Evidently he meant all the race of the Jewish people from the day of that molten calf unto the time in which he spoke to them. They resisted the Holy Ghost and their fathers had done the same thing. Resistance to the Holy Spirit proves beyond question the presence of that Spirit, and its endeavor to exercise influence upon those who resist.

These passages leave no room for doubt as to the sphere of the Spirit's operation. In all ages he has been given to the people to instruct, to lead, and to deliver them from sin; and such is his office at the present time. The allwise Creator comprehended the whole plan of salvation from the beginning. No essential part, factor, or agent, has ever been missing. The Holy Spirit is now the essential agent in delivering man from sin. He has done the same kind of work in all the past days, and he will continue thus to work until time shall end and the destiny of man be sealed forever.

F. R. EARLE.

CHRISTIAN CHARITY IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH.*

THE book, the title of which stands at the head of this article, and which is given in full in the margin, is an exceedingly interesting and valuable volume of 396 pages, exclusive of the "notes" and topical index. The subject of "Christian charity" can receive but little attention and space, of course, in the general history of the ancient church. To the majority of modern readers, whether of the ministry or laity, these general histories are the only sources of information, and hence it comes to pass that comparatively few modern readers know, and can have but little idea, what a delectable dish Dr. Uhlhorn has served for them in this monograph. Such historians as Mosheim, Neander, Giesler and Schaff, can make only incidental mention of it; while Coleman, although his interesting and valuable volume is devoted especially to the prominent characteristics of the early church, devotes only two or three pages to it. Dr. Uhlhorn has laid under contribution the entire field of ancient literature, and gathered from it whatever was trustworthy and needful in unfolding this one theme.

The author divides his volume into three "Books," the titles of which (1, The Old and the New; 2, The Age of Conflict; 3, After the Victory;) are not immediately suggestive of their contents. And some of the sub-titles are not less obscure, giving us only a vague

*CHRISTIAN CHARITY IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH, by Dr. Gerhard Uhlhorn, Abbot of Loccum, translated from the German, with the author's sanction. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1883.

premonition of what the author is going to tell us. So when we from without approach the "table of contents," as every book ought to be approached, we can have but little idea what engaging revelations are going to be made to us within. In this respect the author's vestibule does injustice to his house.

But perhaps we ought to ask at the outset, What *is* Christian charity? It is the charity manifested by Christians, of course. But is it the same as Church charity? Not quite. It is the same in spirit, but not the same always in the manner and extent of its manifestations. Christian charity may be individual, it may be congregational, it may be when and where there is no church. It is compassionate love revealing itself. "Just as the kingdom of God and his Church are not co-extensive," says Dr. Uhlhorn, "so also Christian and Church charity are not co-extensive; just as the kingdom of God has a wider embrace than the Church, so also does charity extend beyond the Church. The State, burgh, communities, corporations, all take part in the performance of this work." Whatever of this kind of work, therefore, is done by individuals, by the State, and corporations, is entitled to be called, must be called, Christian charity, provided it be the overflow, on their part, of compassionate love—that love which has its origin in the love of God as manifested in Christ Jesus. Hence Christian charity is not exclusively ecclesiastical. "It is owing," the author proceeds to say, "to a morbid one-sidedness that in the middle ages charity becomes exclusively ecclesiastical, and it is the consequence of falsely identifying the Church with the kingdom of God, and placing them in opposition to the State as the kingdom of this world." The Church and the State are not to be placed in such antithesis, though

they are not one. The Church is a State within a State, without which it could not exist. The Church should, therefore, not be set over in logical opposition to the secular State; for "the powers that be are ordained of God," are a terror not to good works, "but to the evil."* Neither are the organized Church and the kingdom of God to be confounded. The kingdom of God is spiritual; it is "within you;" it excludes some, perhaps, who are in the Church; it includes many who are not in the Church. It is unlimited; it is also without end. The kingdom of God is the "invisible" Church, in so far as both include all true believers. But the "one-sidedness" of the middle ages, of which Dr. Uhlhorn speaks, was, after all, the one-sidedness of Romanism, which transferred the whole Jewish theory to the Christian Church. The Romanists taught, and still teach, that the Church is essentially an external, organized community, as the commonwealth of Israel; and that to this external society, all the attributes, prerogatives, and promises of the true Church belong; and that membership in that society is the indispensable condition of salvation;† thereby confounding the form with the essence, the visible or external Church with the kingdom of God.

But there is another one-sidedness, in the opposite direction, equally as disastrous to charity. We may contest with the Church, as several are inclined to do now-a-days, its right to the exercise of charity, and especially to the relief of the poor, and to prefer to the Church other organizations. "If the consequence of

*Rom. XIII. 1, 3.

†See Hodge's *Sys. Theol.*, Vol. I. p. 134; Van Oosterzee's "Christian Dogmatics," p. 699, ff.

the exclusively ecclesiastical character of the Charity of the Middle Ages were disastrous to it, they would be not less but more disastrous to-day if the Church were excluded from it. As there could be no kingdom of God upon earth without the Church, so would charity soon die out in all other spheres if the Church desisted from it; and whatever rendering of assistance and care for the poor there might remain would be of quite a different character from compassionate love. For all love has its origin in the love of God in Christ Jesus, of which the Church is witness, not only by her words, but also by her deeds, inasmuch as she practises the works of charity.”*

THE WORLD BEFORE CHRIST.

In order that we may illustrate the ameliorating social influence of Christianity upon the world, let us look first to some features of the social condition of the heathen world before Christ. Lucretius, and Paul in the first chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, give us a dark enough picture of its moral condition. The world without Christ is a world without love. As to the Greek-speaking world before Christ and at the time of Christ, even the word was not in their language.† When Paul wrote to the Corinthians concerning “charity,” the word which he used was comparatively a new one. So also was the thing unknown. Compassion and humanity, says Lactantius, as quoted by our author, are virtues peculiar to the righteous and to the worshippers of God. Philosophy teaches us nothing of them. But Lactantius was a Christian. Per-

*See pp. 71, 72.

†The word *agapee* does not occur in the classical Greek, and in the Septuagint only a few times. See my article on this subject, *Theological Med.*, April, 1879.

haps therefore, it may be thought, his testimony is that of one prejudiced. "How these Christians do love one another!" the heathen themselves were accustomed to say. The heathen about them were constantly astonished at the charitableness of the Christians; it was so strange to them. And the greatest compliment which the apostate Emperor Julian could pay to Christianity, was to endeavor to introduce among his pagan subjects the same spirit and conduct, which he could not but recognize as a peculiarity of Christianity. Compassion was neither a Greek nor a Roman virtue. The religion of the heathen world was polytheistic, and polytheism could never give birth to love. Why not? Because love, charity, presupposes the brotherhood of man, a doctrine which polytheism has ever failed to recognize, and the basis of which, the Fatherhood of one God, it denies. The philosophy of the Stoics recognized it, indeed, but only faintly; and *it* was not generally supposed to *know* anything about it. It did not, for it could not, speak "as one having authority;" and in this respect it was like all other philosophies. And "philosophy is at all times the privilege of the few only." But the *unity* of the human race, as asserted by Stoicism, was scarcely the *brotherhood* of the human race, which must be believed in order to the manifestation of true love. It is possible even for the latter to be believed where the former is denied. So the religion of polytheism was, and always is, a religion without love.

THE HEATHEN POOR.

But what attitude did heathenism occupy, practically, toward its poor? It, or rather the heathen rich man, and to a certain extent the heathen State, was *liberal*, but never *charitable*. A pagan could exhibit natural

pity, but not compassionate love. But what is the difference between liberality and charity, between natural pity and compassionate love? "Canst thou by any means condescend so far as that the poor shall not appear to thee loathsome?" asks the cultured Quinctilian in such way as to indicate that he expects you to say, No, of course not.* And Plautus: "He does the beggar but a bad service who gives him meat and drink; for what he gives is lost, and the life of the poor is but prolonged to their own misery."† Liberality could consistently utter such sentiments, but charity could not. Heathen liberality was self-seeking; Christian charity is self-denying. Christian charity always keeps in view the welfare of the poor and needy, and to help them is its only object. The Greek or Roman who exercised liberality cared nothing for the welfare of the needy as an object in itself. He considered, chiefly at least, the reflex influence which his liberality would have on himself. His vanity might be gratified; the splendor of his name might be increased; or he might thereby win the favor of the multitude, in the shape of votes or otherwise. The Greek and Roman civilizations valued a man only in so far as he was serviceable to the State. But the pauper was of no service to the State; hence he was despised as a cypher. There was no object in preserving his life, and whatever was given to him was regarded as thrown away. But is not happiness an object? and could not the needy be made happy? Yes, happiness is an object; but it is for the most part unattainable. Even heathenism had eyes enough to see the utter futility of taking upon itself the task of

*Quinc. Declamat. 301.

†Plautus, Trinummus, Act III. Sec. 2.

relieving all the misery within its bounds. When happiness is the only object, despair is the only outcome. "All this is of no use; we can never make all men happy," was the true heathen idea. Even Christianity does not go up and down the world with the sole object of relieving human misery; and he who lays stress on this, her secondary function, as if it were her chief one, is liable to conclude that Christianity fails to fulfill her mission. There were many poor widows in Israel in the days of Elijah the prophet, but the prophet was sent only to the widow of Sarepta. There were many lepers in Israel in the days of Jesus of Nazareth, but he healed only a few of them. What of all the others? Christ did not come into the world merely to relieve the suffering; and so much of that as he did was done incidentally, or rather, perhaps, as a means to a higher end. "Christ sees in every man, even in the poorest and most miserable, a human being whose privilege it is to become a member of the kingdom of God." That they might become members of this kingdom was the true and higher end for which he came; and all that Christianity does in the way of removing or alleviating misery and distress, is only done as a means to this end. That is an end which is attainable, and which may be sought without evermore being confronted by despair. But the heathen knew nothing about it. To him there was no kingdom of God, and no future; only the present, and the sooner the miserable, needy one could be rid of it, and burned or buried, the better for him. How could there be, then, such a thing as charity known in the civilization of paganism? There was nothing in the poor, or visible for him, to call it into being and nourish it.

What though on hamely fare we dine,
 Wear koddin gray, and a' that;
 Gie fools their sieks, and knaves their wine—
 A man's a man for a' that,
 For a' that and a' that,
 Their tinsel show, and a' that;
 The honest man, though e'er so poor,
 Is king o' men for a' that—

could scarcely have been written by a heathen, whatever else may be said of Robert Burns.

But was nothing done to relieve their poor and afflicted? Yes, something. Begging was never made a punishable offense in the days of pagan Greece and Rome. That was something. And various isolated acts springing from natural pity are recorded by the historians. "When in the reign of Nero, the great amphitheatre at Fidenæ fell in and buried beneath its ruins 50,000 men, the wealthy Romans despatched physicians and all kinds of medical appliances to the scene of the disaster, and received the wounded into their houses.* At the eruption of Vesuvius, in the year 79, A. D., when Herculaneum and Pompeii were overwhelmed, the readiness to relieve the distressed was universal."† But not many instances similar to these occurred. Men gave gifts to their friends, relatives, or to the club of which they were members, pretty much as they do now. Sometimes one would be elected a member with a view to the handsome donation expected from him, just as the case is now-a-days. One man would build a theatre and present it to his city, another a fountain, another a bath where everybody might bathe gratis, another would make it his care to see that grain or other necessities were always sold at a low price. But all these were isolated acts, and however

*Tacitus, Annals IV, 63.

†See p. 4.

frequently they might have occurred, they would not have been charity—only liberality, at the most, coming out from and going back to the donor, and as different from charity as heathenism is from Christianity. Legacies and testamentary endowments for various purposes were as frequent then, perhaps, as they are now, but they were restricted for the most part to those known to be citizens, and the rich citizen and the higher grade of personages were as apt to get a double share, and the poor none at all, as any other way.

Was there no actual system of poor relief? In a small way there was in Athens. "At Athens those who through bodily weakness or infirmity were unable to gain their livelihood, such as the blind, the lame, and the crippled, received a daily subsidy of two *oboli*.* This subsidy was restricted by law to those whose means amounted to less than three *minæ*.† The vote for it depended upon the popular will. Inquiry into each individual case rested with the Council of the Five Hundred. The orphans of citizens who had fallen in war were brought up at the expense of the State, and their property was not liable to any proper-tax. All this is peculiar to Athens, and is not found elsewhere. And hence in old times Athens had this to her credit, that no one of her citizens ever lacked the necessities of life, or brought shame upon the State by begging from visitors."‡ Later on, however, Athens fell into the hands of demagogues, like Themistocles, gradually lost her supremacy, and sank into the lowest poverty.

Gifts and largesses were showered upon the Roman people in stupendous abundance, and in various forms.

*About six cents of our money.

†About forty-two dollars of our money.

‡Pages 9, 10.

But the people of the conquered provinces were taxed to death in order to do it. And the effect was not such as true charity produces. It was demoralizing in the extreme, as it had before been, though on a smaller scale in Athens. The Roman populace learned more and more to hate work, and to seek pleasure, and to bribe even such matricides as Nero with obsequious flattery in order that they might receive still greater largesses from the imperial treasury, exacted from provincial pockets. The details of the social history of Rome are interesting, and suggestive to us of lessons by no means valueless. But we cannot pursue the subject further here. The outcome of it all was, Rome fell.

AMONG THE HEBREWS.

How was it in the Hebrew nation? Do we find there any completely organized charity, any actual system of poor relief? No, certainly not. Why not? And, especially does the question become pertinent when we consider that the Hebrews were God's peculiarly favored people. Why, then, was there no organized charity, no system of poor relief, among them? Because there was not, and could not be, a great amount of poverty, or any considerable number of paupers among them. The Mosaic legislation was precautionous enough to prevent this. The land-laws required that lands forfeited should always, after appointed intervals, return to its original owner. All debts to Israelites were required to be released at the Sabbatical (7th) year.* Usury was forbidden to be exacted from Israelites.† The people were for the most part hus-

*Deut. xv. 1-11.

†Ex. xxii. 25-27; Deut. xxiii. 19, 20. The Roman Seneca wrote seven books on Good Deeds, and disturbed all Britain by the usurious interest he exacted for the millions he had on loan there.

bandmen. They had no great industries. They lived lives of great simplicity. Everybody worked, and work was respected as a duty imposed by God. None of these things were true of Athens or Rome. Hence they had many paupers, while there were comparatively few among the Hebrews. But there were some poor in Israel, of course. They were not neglected. A number of the enactments of the law are devoted to the relief of their distress and the softening of their condition. The gleanings in field and vineyard were their legal right.* The olive tree was not to be twice shaken; that which was left after the first gathering went to the poor. When one should come in his neighbor's vineyard it was allowable for him to eat as many grapes as he wished, but he could put none into his vessel. When one should come into the standing corn of his neighbor it was allowable for him to pluck the ears with his hand, but he must not use the sickle;† and he must eat the grapes or grains of corn on the spot. It was not lawful to cultivate the land during the Sabbatical year, and the spontaneous fruits of the soil, and the produce of the vine and olive, were not to be gathered, but left for the poor, the stranger, and the cattle.‡ Under the Roman law the idea of property was absolute; under the Hebrew law all proprietorship was relative. Jehovah was the only absolute owner of the land. This was the principle on which was based the Sabbatical rest of the land, and the principle on which was based the claim of the poor to its spontaneous product.§ “The poor shall never

*Lev. xix. 9, 10; Deut. xxiv. 19-24.

†Deut. xxiii. 24, 25.

‡Lev. xxv. 20-22.

§In the general statement of the law, Ex. xxiii. 10, ff., the point of view under which the Sabbatical year is chiefly regarded is *the care of the poor*.

cease out of the land: therefore I command thee, saying, Thou shalt open thy hand wide unto thy brother, who is poor and needy." The poor man must receive his wages daily.* The second tithe was especially for the benefit of the poor, the widow and the fatherless.† The law regarding loans was especially favorable to the poor; it strictly forbade any interest to be taken for a loan to any poor person. Relief to the poor by way of loan was commanded, and excuses for evading this duty were forbidden.‡ The law of pledges also prescribes limitation in favor of the poor. The outer garment, which formed the poor man's principal covering by night as well as by day, if taken in pledge, was to be returned before sunset; in the case of a widow, it would not be taken at all. A creditor was forbidden to enter a house to reclaim a pledge, but was to stand outside till the borrower came forth to return it.§ And all these enactments were in accordance with the popular ideas and spirit which the long and special tuition of the people under Jehovah was intended to inculcate.

See the recent edition of Oehler's *Old Test. Theology*, by Dr. Day, published by Funk & Wagnalls, N. Y., p. 337. The Edinburgh edition, pp. 103, 104, suggests various imports of the law, some of which, however, as those of Ewald and Michaelis, cannot be derived from the text. The former's language implies that the law was based upon the ethical relation recognized by the ancients as subsisting between the owner and his land; Michaelis thinks it was intended to inculcate precaution on the part of the people against dearths.

*Deut. xxiv. 1-15.

†Deut. xiv. 28, 29; xxvi. 12, 13.

‡Ex. xxii. 22-26; Lev. xxv. 35-37.

§Contrast this with the original Roman law of debt, which permitted the debtor to enslave the creditor until the debt was discharged, and even to put him to death. The children, also, of the debtor became enslaved to the creditor, who generally proved to be a cruel master. See Smith's *Dic. Gr. and Rom. Antq. Arts.* "Nexum" and "Bonorum Cessio." As to interest on money loaned, the legal rate at Rome was usually 12 per cent.; sometimes, however, it was 24, 48 and even 60 per cent. See Adam's *Rom. Antq.* p. 355 sq.

"He is ever merciful and lendeth," was the characteristic of the righteous Israelite, as of the truly righteous of all ages. "He considereth the poor." "He showeth favor and lendeth gladly." But there were wicked ones, also, among them, whose tender mercies were cruel. And had not the people, as a nation, been under the special tuition and supervision of Jehovah, who himself is the God of love, they would have been as destitute of compassionate love as any of their heathen neighbors. For the character of the God worshipped is always reflected in the character of the worshippers; and this, in turn, is reflected in their outward lives. This accounts for the difference between the Israelites and the heathen. The God of the one was merciful, considerate, kindly, full of help. He has a father's heart. The gods of the heathen were not. The true Israelite, unlike the heathen, could not treat the poor with contempt, because they stand nearest to Jehovah and are the objects of his loving care.

Nevertheless, as compared with Christian charity, as exhibited in the Gospels and Epistles, the charity of the Israelites had two distinctive peculiarities. First, it was legal. What the Israelite did, he was required by law to do; what he gave must be given at a certain time and in a certain way, the amount being definitely prescribed. It was not the spontaneous and unrestrained outflow of love. It could not have been otherwise than legal at the start; for the Hebrews, at the time of their exodus from Egypt, were, in some respects at least, not far in advance of the heathen. The Mosaic legislation was, even as it related to the poor, largely pedagogic. The spirit of charity must, in some way, be infused into the heart of the people. But the legal element was gradually abused until the whole

emphasis was placed upon the "letter," and, of course, none upon the spirit, as our Savior's strictures upon the Jews of his day make abundantly manifest. The alms-giving of the Pharisees was only the caricature of true love.

Secondly, the charity of Hebrews, and particularly that of the later Jews, as compared with Christian charity, was essentially national. It lacked universality. True, in the old times of the nation, the transient stranger and the foreigner who had taken up his abode in Israel were not forgotten. The "neighbor," whom the Israelite was commanded to love, was not then supposed to be merely a man of one's own nationality. "Ye shall have one ordinance, both for the stranger and for him that is born in the land." "The stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself."* A faint intimation, at least, this may be, that all nations should ultimately become one in the Messiah; though the Israelites failed to see it. And yet the Hebrew and the foreigner were on the same level neither legally nor practically. They could not be so, for Jehovah was in special covenant with Israel, but not with the foreigner, a fact which must be kept prominent in the mind of Israel. A Hebrew might exact interest from a foreigner on account of a loan. The stranger was not released from debt in the Sabbatical year; and he could not inherit land. Hence, we conclude that "the principle of love in the Old Testament," to use the words of Ewald, "is always limited by the idea of the nation." Especially does this become more and more true as the nation grows older, and its

*Num. ix. 14; Lev. xix. 34; See also Ex. xxii. 21; xxiii. 9; Lev. xxiii. 22.

prejudices become concentrated. That which had been called love becomes mere justice, and "neighbor" dwindles into "fellow-Jew." The foreigner is no longer a mere heathen, but is become a heathen dog.* When our Savior said to the Gentile woman, It is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it unto the "dogs," he only quoted a contemptuous epithet of the Jews with which the woman was familiar, in order to test or make manifest her faith. If the Greek was narrow-minded and exclusive on the score of his culture; if the Roman was so on the score of Rome's power; the Jew was equally or more so on the score of his Abrahamic descent and privileges. The Jew of the post-exile period, and particularly of the New Testament, was no less uncharitable than the Greek or the Roman. If he gave alms at all, it was done at the corner of the streets, or with the sound of a trumpet, so that everybody might know it.† But this was not charity. The charity which Christ introduced, and which Paul preached, and which the primitive Christian in particular practised, is not puffed up. It condescends to men of low degree, and does it with the utmost simplicity and naturalness. But the hypocritical descendent of Abraham could, with exquisite grace, turn up his sanctimonious nose, and shy around the poor Samaritan, for fear the touch of his carcass might contaminate his immaculate hands. His typical prayer was, "I give tithes of all I possess, I thank thee that I am not as that publican," and yet, descending from the temple, his habit was to "devour widows' houses." One of the most interesting features in the history of

*Mk. v. 27, 28.

†The party of the Pharisees was the party of the people, and hence what is said of the Pharisees is true, also, to a certain extent at least, of the masses.

Christ's dealings with the Pharisees was the sublime contempt, yet mingled with a divine compassion, with which he looked down on their exquisite littleness and narrow-minded sanctimoniousness. Even Peter the apostle, after three years' intimate personal association with Christ, after the vivid experiences of the day of Pentecost, and an active ministry of several years thereafter, had to receive a new revelation from heaven, thrice repeated, before he could be induced to carry the gospel to the house of the Gentile Cornelius.* It was Christ, and Christ alone, who re-united love to one's neighbor with love to God, so that the two stand or fall together. It was Christ, and Christ alone, who made love to one's neighbor mean love to all men.

AFTER CHRIST.

Let us now briefly notice some of the characteristics, and forms of manifestation, of this charity which Christianity evoked, and to which it gave universality and freedom. It first appears, practically, in the

"COMMUNITY OF GOODS,"

of Acts II. 44, and IV. 34, 35. The Church of the first days "thoroughly bore the character of the family, and was, even in its manner of life, only the continuation of the family-like circle by which our Lord was surrounded. In this circle, community of goods had prevailed. Its members lived upon what was given not merely by those outside, but also by those within it. They contributed according to their means to their common maintenance. And this continued after the Lord's departure, during the days before Pentecost, in the company of the hundred and twenty, and also when this company had been enlarged by the out-pouring of

*See Theological Medium, as before referred to, pp. 172, 173.

the Holy Spirit and the preaching of St. Peter. Each contributed of that which was his own to what was necessary for the common maintenance, without thereby depriving himself of all property. Still less were any compelled to do this, or to persevere in it by any decrees of the Church.”* This was communism; not the unwholesome modern type, however. It was not obligatory and absolute. It did not last long. But whether of the ancient or modern type, communism on a large scale is either practically impossible or destructive. The Apostolic Church recognized the right of private property. It was allowable for a Christian to be rich. “Go and sell all that thou hast,” was not understood literally, only in so far as it was a test. The subsequent Fathers also recognized the same; though the majority of them seem to have held that private property first arose from sin, and that the natural and original order was common property. In a sense this may be true; and the Fathers recognized that the natural and original order was not now the practicable order. They never made any formal attempt to abolish private property among Christians, nor were any decrees passed against the accumulation of wealth. Much was said, however, on the right use of wealth, by which was generally meant *giving*. “A rejection of property on principle is only met with in schismatic circles.”† One of the canons of the Council of Gangra, in opposition to the asceticism of the Eustathians, expressly recognizes the right of property.‡ Still, the emphasis of the patristic expression is placed upon the relinquishment of property on the part of

*Page 73.

†Page 126.

‡About A. D. 380; Gangra the Capital of Paphlagonia.

Christians. He who did this attained thereby to "the higher Christian life"—an unsound view, and for which there was no authority in the teachings of the Apostles.

PRIVATE BENEVOLENCE.

The charity of the early Church was largely of the nature of private benevolence. "The smallness of the churches, which assembled in private houses, still caused but little difference to be found between private charity and that of the Church."* Later on, as the conflict with the surrounding heathenism grew more intense, and the persecutions became severer, great self-sacrifice was found everywhere. The thousands who were the objects of persecution in some section of the empire, not always the same section, had to be cared for; those who were in prison, those who had suffered the loss of property and were in poverty on account of their faith, and those whose entrance into the Church caused them to give up their trade, and thus deprived them of the necessities of life. Nobly did the Christians come to the help of each other. They gave not of their superfluity, for they had no superfluity of which to give, but of their labor, and shunned no sacrifice. "Not till the third century," says Uhlhorn, "do we hear complaints of the abatement of this readiness for self-sacrifice. Hence there needed as yet no special incentive to arouse it, and still less any constraint, whether direct or indirect. It was the time of perfectly free gifts. 'Every man according as he is disposed in his heart!' The Apostolic saying was still the rule; and if here and there some teacher of the third century already spoke of the law of tithes and first fruits, . . . in the presence of the gladness

*Page 88.

with which alms were then bestowed, it sounds like a discord." This boasted age of Christian benevolence furnishes no parallel to the boundless charity of the early Christian. Cyprian sold the estate which he inherited to supply the necessities of the poor, and set apart from his yearly salary a certain portion to be expended in offices of hospitality. So did Basil, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Augustin, and many others. "Of one, it is said that he was but a guest in his own house," says Coleman, "for his house was filled with strangers and with the poor." And of another that he diligently sought by word and by works to minister to the sick and needy. The list of illustration of such individual charity might be increased *ad libitum*.

CHURCH BENEFICENCE.

Very much, also, was done through the Churches. No matter how small the Church might be, it had a treasury, supplied by voluntary gifts, "from which was furnished not only what was necessary for the maintenance of Church officers, so far as these could not maintain themselves, or of travelling evangelists and apostles, but also means for the relief of the poor. Such means were only supplied when a member of the Church was, by reason of age, sickness, or any other misfortune, incapable of earning his bread."* Idlers were not helped, but, according to the Apostolic direction (2 Thes. III. 6), were excluded from the Church. The Church was not as yet, however, encumbered by the dead weight of an indifferent multitude of members, and hence it gave largely; and it gradually came to be the rule that all charities were disbursed by the Church in the person of an appointed official. The Church at Antioch, in Syria, of which Chrysostom

*Page 88.

was pastor, regularly supported 7,700 poor, and to this end the pastor regularly contributed all his salary. And the Church at Antioch was not a rich one, either. The Church at Carthage, of which Cyprian was pastor, contributed four thousand dollars at one time for a benevolent purpose; and the Church at Carthage was both poor and persecuted. The Church at Rome, A. D. 250, says Eusebius, supported more than fifteen hundred widows, besides an indefinite number of the afflicted and needy.[†] And this was in the days of the Decian persecution. In the preceding century it was, as it had been from the beginning, their practice to do good to the brethren, in every way, and to send contributions to needy Churches and destitute Christians elsewhere. "A better idea," says Coleman, "cannot, perhaps, be given of the sentiments of early Christians on this subject than is furnished by an incident which occurred in Rome. The liberality shown to the poor had led a Roman officer, in the days of persecution under Decius, A. D. 251, to believe that Christians had great treasures at their command. Laurentius, one of the deacons or guardians of the poor, was commanded by the Roman prefect to deliver up the treasures of the Church. He demanded three days to comply with the requisition. In that time he collected from the whole city all the poor taken care of by Christian benevolence; and having assembled in the courts and porches of one of their Churches the immense multitude of the aged, infirm, lame, blind, diseased, destitute, poor, who received constant aid from the hands of Christians, he called upon the prefect and said, 'Come, see the treasures of our God;

[†]"Widows, with the afflicted and needy, more than fifteen hundred." Eusebius' *Eccles. Hist.* Bk. VI, ch. XLIII.

you shall see a great court full of vessels of gold, and talents are heaped up in the porches.' The prefect followed, and was shown the assembled poor. 'Behold the treasures I promised you. I add to these the widows and orphans; these are our pearls and precious stones, the crown of the Church. Take this wealth for Rome, for the Emperor, and for yourself.' "

In regard to the tithe law, the early Christians did not recognize it as binding. They did not need it. They were in the state of "first love," and gave often more than a tenth, without being required by law to do so. Free gifts only were asked, and free gifts only were given. The Apostolic rule, Let every one give as the Lord prospers him; or, Let every one give as he is disposed in his heart, was the only rule. Not until the first love begins to wax cold is it necessary to resort to argument and law. The law of tithes and first fruits thereby gradually came to be regarded as binding upon Christians.* The true rule is the Apostolic. Give freely as the Lord prospers you, whether it be one-tenth, or two-tenths, or three.

Other topics, such as Hospitals and Monachism, constitute interesting chapters in the history of Christian charity, but their discussion must be reserved till another time.

*Pages 132, 148, 156 sq., 259.

HEBREW ORIGIN OF THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION.

It was not the severity of punishment but the certainty of detection which produced these marvellous results. Every man was placed in a position of responsibility, a guardian of public order, and thus an appeal was made to all his better feelings. To betray his trust brought shame upon himself, his family and those whose good opinion he prized most, his immediate neighbors. Every citizen was forced to take his share in the government of the neighborhood in which he lived. As the pound is made up of pennies, so the nation is made up of neighborhoods. Therefore, of necessity, if the neighborhoods are well managed, the nation will be well managed. The tithings, or townships bound into hundreds, were the bricks of which the national fabric was built, strong, enduring, unconquerable! The Northman who acknowledged no ruler was free, but it was the freedom of the savage; he was like one of the disintegrated particles of earth of which bricks are made; and at the mercy of every man who was physically stronger than himself.

At the beginning of the collection of Alfred's laws stand about fifty *capitula* or oracles, all taken from the laws of Moses, with the exception of one or two from the canons of the earliest apostolic council. Many changes were introduced by the subsequent Danish and Norman kings, and the only wonder is that so much of the Mosaic legislation still remains. The graduated public assemblies (from the tithing to the house of

commons) formed an uninterrupted communication, through "distinct ducts and channels," from every private citizen to the chief magistrate, and from the chief magistrate again back to the private citizen. For instance, suppose some question of great importance, such as declaring war, or making a treaty, suddenly arises. The king wants to know the opinions and wishes of his subjects on this matter. He puts it to the people, not in our slow, bungling, uncertain fashion, but thus: the rulers of ten thousand (who form one class of officers) each explains the question, either orally or in writing, to his ten subordinate rulers of thousand. It is an easy thing to do, as there are only ten men of them. Each ruler of thousand then explains the matter to his ten subordinate rulers of hundred. The next step is for each ruler of hundred to explain it to his ten subordinate rulers of ten. Each ruler of ten then explains it to the individual members of his tithing, the *Twiændmen*. Now it is fairly before the people—every single man of them. After giving them due time to reflect and discuss the question among themselves, the voting on it begins. The members of each tithing, on a certain day, deposit their votes in the hands of their *gerefa*, or tithing man. They are his immediate neighbors—he knows each face amongst them, as well as he knows the faces of his own brothers, and there is no possibility of an undetected fraudulent vote being cast. On another stated day the tithing men all meet and deposit these votes (with their own vote added) into the hands of the ruler of hundred. The rulers of hundred then add their own individual votes and deposit the whole in the hands of the rulers of thousand. And so on, with perfect and beautiful symmetry, with unerring precision,

with not a single mistake in the whole count—in fact, with no possibility of any mistake being made—the voice of the people, in all its silent majesty and power, rolls its accumulated volume into the great heart of the nation, the senate and king. Never was so matchless a system of representative government invented since the world was made. The yeomanry of England, by this system of self-government, became the finest body of men in the world. That they have decreased so fearfully in numbers, and that other classes of the community have taken their places, is owing to various unfortunate causes. Mr. Fiske calls local self-government the “town-meeting principle.” He says truly, “The town meeting, or the assembly of heads of families, is, so to speak, the primordial cell out of which the tissue of all political life has been woven.” It is this principle which has made the English the most successful colonists in the world. Spain dotted South America with towns ornamented by splendid bridges, cathedrals and mansions. But what did all this outlay of labor and capitol amount to, at last?

One hundred and thirty years ago, France owned more territory in North America than any other nation. From the Hudson bay to the Gulf of Mexico she claimed empire. The English territory in the new world was very small in comparison with that of France. Their colonies were provided for with infinitely more expense and care than were the English colonies. Mr. Fiske’s account of the petting and coddling which mother France bestowed upon her emigrant children, is amusing in the extreme. The home government sent over seed to be planted, and directions how to plant them. They sent over women of the better class for wives for French gentlemen, and women

of the peasant class for wives of the laborers. And each of these prospective brides brought with her a dowry paid by the king. If any colonist remained unmarried, after all this kindness on the part of the home government, he was deprived of many privileges—he was not allowed to hunt or fish or trade with the Indians. The father of ten children received a pension for the rest of his life. All hemp grown in the colony was purchased by the king, at a high price. In short, they received every care and attention from their government, except the privilege of *being allowed to manage their own affairs*. The English colonists had this privilege, and they grew and flourished in spite of every other difficulty. They were the descendants of the yeomanry of the days of good Queen Bess, who could send from their cross-bows, a shaft whistling through a barn door, at 80 paces distance. But it was not mere physical strength which made them what they were. Thanks to the great King Alfred, the habit of centuries had made them self-governing men. No king's officer put his nose into their personal affairs with impunity. "Hands off," was their instinctive cry—as instinctive, to use a homely simile, as the "quack" of a duck. "We will plant what seeds we please, thank your majesty, and we will plant them when we please and how we please. And we will marry or not, just as suits our own inclination. Kings have no more brains than any other men; and while we acknowledge that a nation must have some head (whether king or president or what else), we do not acknowledge his right to meddle in our private affairs." Such were the sentiments of the British colonist, and for them he was ready to die. When they found the home government was doing them injustice, how

quickly they knew how to organize themselves into committees of safety—every neighborhood instinctively alive to its own interests, and efficiently co-operating with the surrounding neighborhoods. “Distinct yet communicating ducts and channels,” like those of Alfred and of Moses. These committees covered the country like an invisible but living net-work; and so well did Gov. Tryon (who ruled first as governor of North Carolina and then of New York) know that, with these vigilance committees, the people could never be crushed, that he said, in 1777, “I should, had I more authority, burn every committeeman’s house within my reach; and in order to purge the country of them, I will give \$25 for every active committeeman who shall be delivered up to the king’s troops.” What would be done with them, we can easily guess, when we remember that he had, with his own hands, murdered Thompson, the Regulator; and had, by his violent threats, driven Judge Berry to suicide.*

The committees “compacted the whole people, like a rock of conglomerate; while the French colonists remained in a state of political segregation, like a basket of pebbles held together by the enclosure that surrounded them.” The French were governed by prefects and intendants, appointed by the home government, while the English elected from themselves their own local magistrates.

The “primordial cell” of the Anglo-Saxons was variously named, ward, tithing, township, manor, committee—but it, in the end, always amounted to the same thing, *neighborhood self-government*. The successful working of the vigilance committee, in Califor-

*Wheeler’s History of North Carolina.

nia, after everything else, in the way of government, had failed, proves that, in very lawless conditions of society, it is the only government possible; therefore, it is the strongest government possible. What the vigilance committee did in California, Alfred the Great's tithings did in England some ten centuries ago.

The English court of tithing could not try cases of great importance. The court of the hundred was the important court of justice in the days when Englishmen were moulded into freemen. "Rulers of tens, rulers of fifties, and rulers of hundreds, and rulers of thousands," was the divine model. This numerical proportion of rulers puts twelve men into the jury box and a judge upon the bench. The ruler of hundred was the judge, the ten rulers of ten and two rulers of fifty were the jury, and the priest was the lawyer who explained the law. In the early ages of Anglo-Saxon government, the jury was always composed of the neighbors of the accused, his own tithings and his own hundred. They were the men who knew him best, loved him if there was anything lovable in him—at any rate, more likely to do him justice than strangers. And it was not until the reign of Queen Anne that they ceased to require the jury to come *de vicineto*.

When William the Conqueror was crowned a second time, in order to share the coronation of his wife, newly arrived in England, he repeated a second time the oath to preserve inviolate that great palladium of English liberty, the right of trial by jury.*

"The trial by jury has ever been," says Blackstone, "and I trust will ever be, the glory of the English law. It is the most transcendent privilege which any

*Strickland's Queens of England.

subject can enjoy or wish for, that he cannot be affected either in his property, his liberty, or his person, but by the unanimous consent of twelve of his neighbors and equals." All trials at common law may be called, in one sense, jury-made law.

Not only every lawyer, but every citizen, every woman and every child (over twelve years old), ought to be made fully aware of the distinctive character of these two systems of administering justice: common law and statute law. The one is trial by jury, the other without jury. The former is the famous unwritten law—*lex non scripta*—which is peculiarly and entirely English. No written law binds the action of the twelve good and true men who form the English jury. In every case of trial they are solemnly informed what existing laws bear upon the subject, but they are not bound to abide by any law, either written or unwritten, except the law of God written upon their own Bible-enlightened mind and consciences. Kent, in his commentaries on the American Law, says: "We cannot but admire the intrepidity and powerful sense of justice which led Lord Coke, when Chief Justice of the K. B., to declare that the common law doth control acts of parliament and adjudges them void when against common rights and reason. Lord Chief Justice Holt, agreed with him. But King James, who would have been glad to abolish constitutional government entirely, said, "In Coke's reports, there are many dangerous conceits of his own, uttered for law, to the prejudice of crown, parliament and subjects."

The greatest victory ever gained by the English people was probably the victory of the advocates of the common law over the advocates of the statute law. The contest was long, in fact, lasted more than a hun-

dred years, but was fought out to the end, from generation to generation, with that patient, dogged persistence which is so marked a characteristic of the English people. "Our great father, Alfred, gave us the divine common law, and in spite of kings and priests we will keep it," was the united sentiment of the body of the people. The statute law was sometimes styled the "civil law," and sometimes the "Roman law." The common law was sometimes entitled "English law," and sometimes "municipal law." The word "municipal" has several significations, but its meaning as used by the English is merely *local self-government*. Again I quote Kent: "Sir John Fortescue's work, '*De Laudibus Legum Angliæ*' (translated into English by the learned Selden), undertakes to show that the common (or English) law was superior to the civil (or Roman) law. He ran a parallel between the common and civil law, in order to show the superior equity of the former, and that the proceedings in courts of justice were less dilatory than under the Roman law. And while upon this author, we cannot but pause and admire a system of jurisprudence, which contained such a singular and invaluable provision in favor of life, liberty and property, as those which Fortescue describes. They were unprecedented in all Greek and Roman antiquity, and being preserved, in some degree of freshness and vigor, amidst the profound ignorance and licentious spirit of the feudal ages, they justly entitle the common law to a share of that constant and vivid eulogy which the English lawyers have always bestowed upon their municipal institutions." To use the words of another learned jurist, "We live in the midst of the common law, we inhale it at every breath, we imbibe it at every pore; we meet it when we awake,

and when we lay down to sleep, when we travel and when we stay at home; it is interwoven with the very idiom we speak; and we cannot learn another system of laws, without learning, at the same time, another language."

I copy the following passage from still another able English writer: "The statute or civil law was first introduced into England by Theobald, a Norman abbot, who was elected to the see of Canterbury in 1138; and he appointed a professor (Roger, surnamed Vicarius, prior of Beck in Normandy), who opened a school in the University of Oxford, to teach it to the people of this country. Nevertheless, it gained ground very slowly; King Stephen, in 1149 issued a proclamation, forbidding the study of it; upon which Vicarius returned to Normandy. But the bishops and clergy, many of whom were foreigners, applied themselves wholly to the civil and common laws (which now came to be inseparably interwoven with each other); whereas the nobility and laity adhered with equal pertinacity to the common law. These two parties manifested a reciprocal jealousy of each other; as appears, on the one hand, from the spleen with which the monastic writers speak of our municipal laws upon all occasions; and, on the other, from the firm temper which the nobility showed at the famous parliament of Merton. (Stat. Merton. 20 Hen. III, c. 9.) The same jealousy appears above a century afterwards (11 Rich. II), when the nobility declared, with a kind of prophetic spirit, that "the realm of England hath never been unto this hour, neither by the consent of our lord the king, and the lords of parliament shall it ever be, ruled or governed by the civil law." The clergy, at length finding it impossible to root out the municipal, or com-

mon law, began to withdraw themselves from the temporal courts; and to that end, very early in the reign of Henry III, episcopal institutions were published, forbidding all ecclesiastics to appear as advocates *in foro seculari*; and wherever they retired, and wherever their authority extended, they displayed the same zeal to introduce the rules of the civil, in exclusion of the municipal law. The struggle between the laws of England and of Rome was continued through the reigns of Henry II, John and Henry III, the former supported by the strength of the temporal nobility, while the Romish clergy endeavored to supplant them in favor of the latter. This dispute was kept on foot until the reign of Edward I, when the laws of England, under the new discipline, introduced by that skilful commander, obtained a complete and permanent victory."

The clergy were too unlearned, as a general thing, in Saxon literature, to perceive that Alfred's institutions originated in the Bible, the book which they professed to receive as their guide, in all things. Pope Innocent IV, forbade the clergy of England to have anything to do with the municipal or common law, "because its decisions were not founded on the imperial constitutions, but merely on the customs of the laity." The "Roman imperial constitutions" was what they adhered to, with so much zeal; the "matchless written reason" of the most learned body of heathen lawyers and emperors. "They therefore entirely despised the common law of England, and esteemed it little better than heretical," although the one came from a divine, the other from a human source. Had Alfred the Great added some other Hebrew laws, in regard to the tenure of lands, he would have saved the English

nation from many subsequent calamities. All the books written upon political economy contain no wisdom equal in all its vast bearings, to the few sentences, on the ownership of land, in the Mosaic code. "To *every one* shall his inheritance of land be given." "The children of Israel may enjoy *every man* the possession of his fathers." "The land shall not be sold forever, for the land is mine, saith the Lord."

Nothing shows the infidelity of our age so strikingly as the fact that no political economist looks to the Bible for a remedy for those evils which are making Europe the hot-bed of revolutionary communists, socialists and nihilists. Every statesman acknowledges the importance of agriculture to the state. That system should be adopted which produces the largest amount of food and textile materials for the people. It is not the land itself, but its products, which ought to fill the marts of commerce. The lands—in other words, the homes and livings of the people—are too sacred to be sold. It is not quite so horrible as selling one's wife or child, but it is the next thing to it.

We call our age a highly civilized one; and there are, I admit, a number of highly civilized persons in every great nation. But this small class does not constitute "the people." According to the statistics of Mr. M. G. Mulhall, published recently in a London review, "Scotland possesses to-day more wealth in proportion to its population than England, and, from this point of view, is the richest country in the world." This being the case, we will use Scotland as an illustration. An eminent Scotchman, Dr. Arthur Mitchell, says (in one of his series of lectures on the question, "What is Civilization?"): "Taking Scotland as a whole, it is found that 88.5 per cent. live in houses of

four rooms and under. Few, if any, of the class who inhabit such houses, pay national taxes." So that, from the above statement, it may be inferred generally that the remaining 11.05 per cent. support the government, and constitute what we call the civilized class. Dr. Mitchell continues: "If we take out of the city of Glasgow every person whose name is in the Postal Directory, even if the size and scope of the Directory were doubled, the population of the city would not be materially influenced." Just think of the above statements for a moment! Glasgow is the largest and richest city in Scotland; Scotland is the richest country (in proportion to the population) in the world. Yet the density of the population of Glasgow would scarcely be affected if every educated (civilized) person were taken out of it. Oh! the pity of it!—the horror of it! Does it require (as seems from the statistics of Glasgow itself) ninety-two persons to live the life of slaves, in order that eight persons shall be gentlemen? We do not, it is true, call the ninety-two work people slaves; we call them, in our self-delusion, free and enlightened citizens. They constitute the class known in Europe as the *Prolitariat*: people who depend for their living on their daily labor. If this living by daily labor were anything like a certainty, there would not be so much cause of complaint. A writer in *Blackwood's Magazine* (Vol. LXX., No. 4), a few years ago, said: "The lamentable depression of trade, and consequent want of employment, have now reached a most serious magnitude in many of the larger towns, and most of all in London and its far-spreading suburbs. Men, women and children are dying of sheer famine in the heart of the wealthiest city in the world. Not a week passes without several cases of 'deaths from

starvation,' duly attested by the verdict of coroners' inquests, where the medical and other evidence reveals an amount of unaided wretchedness and starvation which one would suppose impossible in a civilized country." A writer in the *London Quarterly* (January, 1872) says, in speaking of this class: "We agree with them, that their condition is an opprobrium to half the countries in Europe, and more especially so to our own. Millions of them lead a life which intelligent beings should not consent to live, and exist in a condition of struggle and wretchedness which makes existence a burden and not a boon. They have a right to be discontented. They do well to be angry. Nay, more—the rectification, speedy and thorough, of the evils of their condition, is the first duty of every statesman, and the most urgent necessity of every State; and all legislation which does not address itself, mediately or immediately, to this supreme purpose, is of secondary moment, and involves a postponement of higher to lower claims. The improvement of the condition of the proletariat constitutes the primary obligation of all who influence opinion, or rule the country; first, because these classes are the most numerous (so much the most numerous, please remember, that were all the other classes removed bodily, there would be a scarcely perceptible diminution of the population); secondly, because they are the most helpless; thirdly, because they are the most suffering; and we share, to the full, in the burning indignation they express, when questions vital to their interests are pushed into the back-ground, to let party conflicts have a fair field to fight in. So far we go along with the loudest and most violent of their leaders. But there we part company as widely as may be. Our indictment against these

leaders is, that they systematically and persistently, even if honestly, divert the people's attention from their real grievances, and urge them to measures wholly irrelevant, or certain to aggravate what they seek to cure. These leaders are forever hounding the people on a false scent, guiding them away from the right track, misinforming them as to the facts, misteaching them as to principles, and confounding their perceptions as to friends and foes."

The reviewer then goes on to state that the only remedies for slavish poverty and helplessness are thrift, economy, industry, etc. But this no one can believe with the statistics of civilized nations before him. John Stuart Mill calls attention to the unfortunate disproportion of those who live by *distributing*, compared with those who live by *producing*. One butcher, or baker, or grocer, may thrive honestly in a place where *five* must either cheat or starve. The only possible permanent remedy for these intolerable grievances is to make them tillers of the soil. Not mere agricultural laborers, the most brutish of all classes of laborers, but *owners* of the land. England has colonial territory enough, and wealth enough, to make every one of her now cruelly treated sons a land owner. Then, when this great work is accomplished, let her laws interpose to prevent the sale of lands; make them unalienable, like those of the Hebrews.

Had Alfred the Great been bold enough to enact the laws of Moses, in regard to the tenure of lands, as well as in the formation of legislative and judicial courts, England would now be, not a nation of oppressed and ignorant working men, but a nation of independent, educated and prosperous freemen.

The Mosaic law, while it made every man a landed

proprietor, did not tie the population to the soil. The owners had a right to lease or rent their lands for a longer or shorter period, not however to exceed forty-nine years. Say he is twenty-one when he makes the lease, he will be seventy years old when the lease expires, if it is for forty-nine years. This shows that he could divest himself of his land during his lifetime, *but it was out of his power to deprive his children of their inheritance.* He himself may abjure agricultural pursuits and engage in commerce, navigation, manufacturing, literature, or any other pursuit he has a genius for, but, thank God—yes, truly thank a tender, merciful, pitiful God—he cannot make slaves of his children, by depriving them of their inheritance.

Mr. Bright's scheme for regenerating Ireland is this: Have the State acquire, by fair means, the ownership of (say) half the land of the great proprietors of that country, in order to establish small land owners in their place. "In this way, he supposes, peace and prosperity might be ensured. But suppose these desirable objects attained; what next? The new peasant proprietary would be beset with handsome offers to purchase their estates. They would be offered sums for which they could obtain elsewhere, better interest than the produce of these estates. They would certainly yield to the temptation, sell their lands, and thus place themselves and their children again in the helpless servitude of the proletariat." They would not be taught, by their priests the piety of Naboth, who, when tempted by his lord Ahab to sell his land, replied fervently, "The lord forbid it me, that I should sell the inheritance of my fathers unto thee!" To him, such a sale would have been an atrocious sin. In Dr. Hawksley's book, the "Charities of London," he shows that

the sums annually distributed for charitable purposes amount to seven and a half millions of pounds! Yet its actual paupers only number something over 150,000. If this money were wisely spent, it would provide colonial homes and lands and a fair prospect of support for each one of them. True, they themselves would not always be able to work the land; they would probably mismanage it every way that it could be mismanaged; but if selling it was made, by law, an impossibility, its ownership would work out, in the end, its own benign and beautiful results. In some countries parents are allowed to sell their children. A Circassian father sometimes realizes a small fortune by selling a beautiful daughter to a wealthy Turk. To him there is no sacrilege in selling his daughter; to the peasant there is no sacrilege in selling his land. Yet there is shocking sacrilege in both the one and the other. The Circassian makes his daughter a slave; the peasant who sells his land throws all of his children again into the proletariat class, who are as certainly and more hopelessly slaves, than the wives of the Turks. The latter are not in danger of dying the horrible death of starvation.

In the United States, land is, as yet, so abundant, that the results of selling it are not so unfortunate as in more crowded countries. But even here many evils are attendant upon it. The feeling of almost every landholder is that of discontent with his present surroundings. The oft-recurring topics of conversation between him and his neighbors is, how much more money they could make in some newer region, or in some other employment. With this feeling of discontent and expectation of change, little or no improvements are made. "Why," they ask, "should we waste

money on a place we expect to leave?" But just once pass the law of unalienable homestead (be it ten, twenty, one hundred or one thousand acres; in England, ten; in Texas, one thousand); let the farmer fully realize that he can no more divest himself of the amount of his land which the law fixes as his homestead than he can divest himself of his own head; that it will belong to his children to the latest generation, and see how differently he will regard it. No money spent upon it can be lost; debt itself can only alienate it for a time. Even if he becomes a total bankrupt, his creditors can only hold his homestead for forty-nine years (according to the Hebrew law), and at the end of that time it returns to his children, or his nearest of kin. Such considerations would give him a new and intense interest in the land; he would love it with every emotion of poetry, piety, and sentiment in his nature; he would think no care or expense too great spent in beautifying his mansion and enriching his soil; he would be a nobler man; he would live a holier and happier life. He would be a truer patriot, for in proportion to a man's love of his own home is his love of his country. It would make him a kinder neighbor, more identified with the interests of his township, his county and his state. He would far more cheerfully contribute to public improvements. "If," he reflects, "I and my children are to remain just here for the rest of our lives, it is important to us to have good roads, good bridges, good school houses and good churches." He would cease to spend hours in useless dreams and speculations about the advantages of newer countries and more lucrative employments. Yet, as I said before, he is not tied to the soil. If some other employment should present advantages

obviously great, he would have the right to rent his land for one, two, ten, or, at the farthest, forty nine years. Beyond the last mentioned period his control could not extend. In every possible way the Hebrew law of the unalienable homesteads would work well.

J. E. Thorold Rogers, Professor of Political Economy in the University of Oxford, Eng., says: "No Englishman, who has the courage to forecast the destinies of his country, can doubt that its greatest danger lies in the present alienation of its people from the soil, and in the future exodus of a disinterested peasantry." All statesmen who venture to think for themselves must acknowledge this opinion to be correct. Neither interest nor affection exists in the mind and heart of the laboring man to bind him to a country where he towns no home, and has no absolute certainty of employment. What other tie can possibly bind him to his native soil? Why should he uphold a government in which he has no tangible interest? He can save himself from want as easily in France, Germany, Italy, and far more easily in the colonies, or in the United States. He is a cosmopolitan; a citizen of the world; what is his native land to him? What but a cruel and unrighteous step-dame, who has withheld from him his birthright?

England keeps the land permanently in the hands of the rich by her laws of primogeniture. The Hebrews, too, had a law of primogeniture, but it was very different from that of the English. The eldest son had not all, but only a double portion of the land. Thus, if there were four brothers, and the land was worth \$25,000, the eldest brother received with the family mansion \$10,000 worth of land, while the three younger sons would each have \$5,000 worth of land,

or property equivalent to that amount. This enabled the eldest brother to give a home and maintenance to any helpless members of the family, and to fulfill, in some measure, his father's duties to them. Had this law existed in England from the time when the lawless Norman soldiers forcibly wrested the land from the rightful owners, it would not now be in such immense bodies, but would be divided into very numerous smaller homesteads.

Ruskin, another Oxford professor, says the present "lords of the soil take the food and labor of the peasants, who are their slaves," and spend them in vicious luxury in the great cities. What right has the English law to distinguish in favor of these lords of the soil, and force the wealth of the country into their hands, while the rest of the population never cease to stare in the face the gaunt wolf of want?

H. M. IRWIN.

EDITORIAL.

ANOTHER number of the REVIEW is sent out upon its peculiar mission. The first number of the present volume was issued under many difficulties and some embarrassments; and was not what it ought to have been and would have been under more favorable circumstances. Errors crept in—some of them glaring—which were not discovered until too late for correction. The reception it has met at the hands of its readers has been all, perhaps, that could have been expected. Many kind, hopeful and encouraging words have been spoken for it, while due patience has been exercised in regard to its faults. For all of this the editor expresses his gratitude. The REVIEW has a place to fill and a work to do in the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. There is an abundance of material from which to enrich its places. The best writers are willing to contribute to it their varied stores of knowledge. It can and ought to be made an important factor in the literature of the Church. That which is most needed now is a sufficient patronage to justify the outlay necessary to make the publication what it ought to be. The editor promises to do all within his power to realize the most sanguine expectations. He asks all the friends of the enterprise to interest themselves for its success. While the present number is superior to the former one, those that may follow will be superior to this, if possible. Let the help be given at once.

The reader is asked to make the following verbal corrections in the article in the January number, "An

Exposition of the Book of Job," by Rev. S. R. Chadick: Page 40, line 27, read "wary" instead of "navy." Page 44, act 4, line 2 of the caption, insert "heads" after "dust besprinkled." Page 46, line 8, read "penitent" instead of "persistent"; line 29 read "impressive" instead of "impulsive." Page 47, line 7, read "pervert" instead of "prevent," and "overtook" instead of "overlooked." Page 51, line 5 from the bottom, read "smoothed" instead of "smothered"; line 2 from the bottom read, "and still believe in the calm confidence," &c.

LITERARY NOTICES.

SCRIPTURAL IDEA OF MAN. By Mark Hopkins, D. D.
Price, \$1.00. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

Certainly the Church keeps abreast of the world in this age of struggle and progress. At no previous period in history, we are bold to say, has there been so much activity in every department of Christian life and work. Nor can we allow that we have but exchanged a stagnant pool for a stormy sea; rather for a flowing and fertilizing (even if at times rapid) stream. For the age we live in, with all its faults, we may well thank God. Among the best signs of the times is the greatly increased vigor with which the warfare with infidelity is being carried on. No doubt the disappearance of infidelity altogether would be better still; but this we have no reason to expect under the present dispensation; and meanwhile we may rejoice that the Church of Christ is making unusually strenuous efforts both to strengthen men against its allurements, and to secure those who have been entangled in its toils. In these days when materialism, Darwinism and spontaneous generation are pushing forward with so much vigor, it is cheering to meet with an author who can successfully grapple with these hypotheses; and can vindicate our common-sense belief that man is not a mere lump of flesh, and that he did not spring from a monkey, a tadpole, or a nomad. Dr. Hopkins is well known to most of our readers, and is as much loved as known. He is a scholar, but his power does not lie in his scholarship. He is a thinker, but his influence does

not lie in his profundity. It always seemed to us to have sprung from the sanctified humanity in the man, aided by extraordinary mental endowments. These qualities are transparent in almost all the productions of his pen, and are to be seen in the "*Scriptural Idea of Man*," now before us. This book is composed of six lectures, which were delivered before the students in the Theological Seminary at New Haven, in 1875. These lectures were repeated at Chicago and at Oberlin. As now published, they were delivered March, 1883, before the students of the Theological Seminary at Princeton. The first lecture treats of the creation of man; the second and third treat of the creation of man in the image of God in knowledge, in feeling, in freedom, in causative power; the fourth treats of the moral nature of man; the fifth, of man created to have dominion; the sixth, of man in his present state. We have read these lectures with very great pleasure. They are brimful of close reasoning, and yet not in the least difficult to follow, but thoroughly interesting from beginning to end. Should one begin to make quotations illustrative of this remark, there would be no end of them. Every paragraph is trenchant and conclusive, and bears witness that the author lays his hand on the subject firmly, and that he can squeeze a statement with no child's grasp to see what it contains. These lectures are condensed to the last degree not to be obscure, are indeed *multum in parvo*. We have here the cream of the whole subject of man's correlations presented in a singularly clear and logical manner, and with a cumulative force that cannot fail to carry conviction to any mind who will give it anything like an unprejudiced perusal. In conclusion, we sincerely thank Dr. Hopkins for his very

able and masterly work, which we cordially recommend to all our readers who are interested in these great problems which are occupying the minds of the greatest thinkers of our age. M.

THE THEORY OF MORALS. By Paul Janet, Member of the Institute, author of "Final Causes," &c. Translated from the latest French edition. Price \$2.50. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

This is a work which will have a charmed, if small, circle of readers. It is more than usually vivacious for a work of this kind. The author has put such careful and comprehensive study before the reader as to enlist his interest at the start, and lead him from page to page through the entire book. While in places there seems to be a little obscurity in meaning, for the most part the meaning is clear, and some of the passages are very fine. Occasionally the work seems marred by some indelicate illustration, although these are usually to the point. The author starts with the truth that there is a natural good in every object of our choice, which is the basis of moral good. This inherent quality he calls excellence. Thus a radical difference is made between pleasure and good, and law and good. There are degrees of excellence, with corresponding degrees of good. The highest excellence is the perfection of man in the generic sense, and the feeling arising from efforts to attain thereto is happiness. Distinction is made between the good, the true, and the beautiful. The law of duty requires us to seek our perfection, and is both immutable and universal.

In the discussion of such chapters as those on "Division of Duties," and "Conflict of Duties," there is

room for difference of opinion. The author seems not to have apprehended the truth in regard to the Scriptures when he says: "Kant may be said to be the first moralist who brought out clearly the principle that man owes to himself what he owes to other men—that is, respect; that he should not assail the dignity of human nature in himself any more than in other men. . . . Undoubtedly Christian morality, when properly understood, contains nothing which is directly opposed to these principles. Religious duty has sometimes exalted in a sublime manner the feeling of human dignity, but in daily practice Christianity has rather weakened than fortified this virtue. Undoubtedly, too, so far as concerns the purity which a man owes to himself, and which is a part of the duty of respecting himself, Christian morality requires too much rather than too little."* The reference here is to what Paul says about marriage and the unmarried state; for in the foot-note the author says: "For example, it is asking too much to require us to regard the state of celibacy or virginity as a more perfect state than that of marriage." Such an interpretation of the Bible doctrine upon the subject of marriage is certainly unwarranted, either by Christians in their daily practice, or by the Scriptures themselves. To quote the Roman Catholic Church upon the subject is not at all satisfactory.

While advocating a high standard of morality in the conduct of men, the author, by some strange lapse of conscience, at the same time excuses the same thing he condemns. When he says, "No espionage is shameful except that which is accompanied by perfidy and treachery; for example, that of one who feigns friendship that he may more easily betray, or of the traitor

* Pp. 232, 233.

who passes himself off as a thief that he may better help to catch the thieves,"* the Christian conscience will heartily endorse; but when he continues, with almost the same breath, "It is this sort of espionage which is shameful, though it may be useful and even necessary," one can only wonder how, in any theory of morals, a "shameful" practice can be both "useful and even necessary."

These are flies in the ointment. The work as a unit will command the attention and admiration of thoughtful readers, and will form a valuable addition to the literature on this all-important subject.

THE YOKE OF CHRIST, by Anthony W. Thorold, D. D., is a pure book, full of sweet, tender and lofty thought about the common duties and circumstances of life. It is full of suggestions—may be called a suggestion—as to the way in which Christianity may be and ought to be wrought into the whole texture of life. The author says in his preface: "If spiritual religion is ever to be recognized by the people at large as an actual force in life, and if the deep crevasses, that now only too conspicuously yawn between the ideals of religious professors and their conduct, are presently (by their disappearance) to cease to justify flippant unbelievers in their scornful rejection of the person and faith of Christ, we Christian teachers must look to it, and at once." So in plain, earnest language the author proceeds to discuss six topics: Illness, Letter-writing, Friends, Money, The Loss of Friends, and Marriage. He analyzes motives, answers objections, and, in the light of the Scriptures, shows duty in the various rela-

* P. 257.

tions of life. The whole is an excellent companion in solitude or contemplative moods. We give a short extract from the chapter on Friends: "The person who protects himself from the plain duties of friendship by the shallow and selfish evasion that he never asks a favor, is a simple imposter, who cannot too soon be exposed and unmasked. One of the conditions of having friends is that we show ourselves friendly. Reason explains it, necessity justifies it, affection facilitates it, society expects it, God prospers it, Jesus is its loftiest example, grateful love is its sweet and sure reward." Price, \$1.25. Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., New York.

GENERAL NOTES.

A GREAT DISCOVERY IN APOSTOLIC CHURCH HISTORY.—In the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Leipzig, 1883, No. 3, Prof. Adolph Harnack, of Giessen, gives an interesting account of the "Teaching of the Apostles," which has just been published by the learned metropolitan bishop of Nicomedia, Philotheos Bryennios. It is a pleasant surprise for students of church history to receive a new document from the second century. The name of the book was known. Clement, of Alexandria, quotes it as "Scripture;" Eusebius places it beside the "Shepherd," the "Apocalypse of Peter," and the "Epistle of Barnabas;" and Athanasius regards it, not, it is true, as a canonical, but as one of the books appointed to be read by catechumens. In the *Stichometry* of Nicephorus it stands between the gospel of Thomas and the epistle of Clement. Moreover, we had the first six chapters of the book (the whole book is about as long as the epistle to Galatians), for the most part in the moral teachings in Barnabas, in the "Constitutions," and "Didaskalia" and in the "Epitome oron"; but these ordinances become of an entirely new value when we find them in this work, the great age of which can be proved. The second part—Chapters vii-xvi—is essentially new, although the seventh book of the "Constitutions" proves to be a recasting and, so to speak, modernizing of it.

This book, then, is laid before us by Bryennios, edited with great care. Its genuineness Harnack acknowledges to have been proved by the editor. The

trifling external fact is not worthy that the stichometry of Nicephorus gives 200 as the number of lines and in the manuscript discovered it has 203. In Harnack's opinion, even the "Shepherd of Hermas" can hardly compete with the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" in antiquity, and it belongs in one class with the oldest documents we possess from the Gentile Church. The peculiarity of the book is increased by the fact that it is the oldest book of church order that is known. It throws light on points in the epistle to the Ephesians, in Acts, in the first epistle of Clement, in Hermas, and in Lucian's "Peregrinus." Harnack leaves the date for the moment open; but, whatever place may be assigned to it between 100 and 160, it places the church before us at a period of which we know very little.

It may have been written in Syria or Egypt. It will have to be our guide in the future in our treatment of "apostles," "prophets," "teachers," bishops and deacons. The title "apostles" is used exclusively in the sense of wandering evangelists; presbyters are not mentioned at all. It is a first-class document for the history of the constitution of the church and for the history of worship.

The fact is that in the "Teaching" we have the beginning of the entire body of literature in the ancient Oriental Church, which refers to church order or constitutions; and that it makes clear much that was doubtful before. For example, to recur to the seventh book of the "Constitutions," mentioned above, the "Teaching" bears about the same relation to it that the shorter Ignatian epistles do to the longer. The reviser modernized the old book, put "priests" for "prophets," put "presbyters" in, and smoothed down the eschatology and thinned out the prayers.

Bryennios shows how his new volume confirms a conjecture of Prof. Gustav Bickell's, and an assertion of Harnack's with reference to the "Epitome oron." Bickell, and after him Dr. Oscar Von Gebhardt, had pointed to some older book now lost as the true basis of the "Constitutions," Book VII, and of the "Epitome;" and here we have that older book. Besides, Harnack had insisted upon it that the "Epitome," as it was, could not be of the second century, but must be later than the "Constitutions;" and Bryennios supports this.

Harnack translates the larger and more interesting part of the book into German, and, the original having not yet reached us, we translate from Harnack's advance sheets just received:

"7. But as to baptism, baptize thus: Baptize after thou has imparted all the above doctrines [the moral teachings of chapters i-vi], in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, in flowing water. If, however, thou hast no flowing water, then baptize with other water; if there be no cold at hand, with warm. But if thou hast neither, then sprinkle the head three times with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. But before the baptism, the baptizer and the baptized are to fast. . . . Thou shalt command the baptized to fast a day or two beforehand.

"8. Your fasts are not to be ordered like those of the hypocrites; for these fast on Monday and Thursday. Ye, however, shall fast on Wednesday and Friday. Neither shall ye pray like the hypocrites, but pray as the Lord has commanded in his gospel: 'Our Father,' etc. Three times a day shall ye pray thus.

“9. As for the eucharist, ye shall give thanks : First, in reference to the cup : ‘We thank thee, our Father, for the holy vine of thy child David, which thou hast revealed to us through thy child Jesus. Honor be to thee to eternity.’ In reference to the broken bread, however : ‘We thank thee, our Father, for the life and the knowledge which thou hast declared unto us through thy child Jesus. Honor be to thee to eternity. As this broken bread was strewn upon the hills [that is, as grain] and brought together and became one, so may thy church be brought together from the ends of the earth into thy kingdom ; for thine is the honor and power through Jesus Christ to eternity.’ Let no one, however, eat or drink of your eucharist except those baptized in the name of the Lord ; for in reference to this the Lord said : Ye shall not give that which is holy to the dogs.

“10. After ye have eaten, ye shall give thanks thus : ‘We thank thee, Holy Father, for thy holy name, for which thou has prepared a dwelling in our hearts, and for the knowledge, and the belief, and the immortality, which thou hast made known to us through thy child Jesus ; to thee be honor in eternity. Thou, Almighty Lord, hast created all for thy name’s sake ; food and drink thou hast given to men for their use, that they may thank thee ; but upon us thou hast graciously bestowed spiritual food and drink and eternal life through thy child. Above all we thank thee because thou art mighty. To thee be honor to eternity. Remember, Lord, thy church, to lead her forth out of all evil, and to perfect her in thy love ; gather her together from the four winds, her, the consecrated one, into thy kingdom, which thou hast prepared for her. Thine is the power and the honor to eternity. Let grace

•

come and let this world vanish away. Hosanna to the Son of David! Let him that is holy, come forward; let him that is not, repent. Maranatha. Amen.' But permit the prophets to say thanks, as much as they please.

"11. Whosoever now comes [to you] and teaches you all this that has just been said, him receive. If, however, the teacher himself teaches in perverseness another doctrine, so that he annuls the above, hear ye him not; but if he teaches so that he increases righteousness and the knowledge of the Lord, then receive him as the Lord.

"In reference to the apostles and prophets, moreover, ye shall proceed as follows, according to the directions of the gospel: Let every apostle, who comes to you, be received as the Lord. He will not remain longer than a day, or if necessary a second day; if he remains three days he is a false prophet. When the apostle goes away again, let him take nothing with him but bread enough for a day; if he asks for money he is a false prophet. And every prophet that speaks 'in the Spirit,' him ye shall neither examine nor condemn; for every sin is forgiven; but this sin is not forgiven. But not every one that speaks 'in the Spirit' is a prophet, but only he who shows the behavior of the Lord. By his behavior therefore the false prophet and the prophet can be recognized. No prophet [speaking] 'in the Spirit' orders a meal and eats of the same, unless he is a false prophet. Every prophet, moreover, who teaches the truth, is a false prophet if he does not do what he teaches. But every prophet, proven and true, who performs an action to symbolize the mystery of the church in the world, but at the same time does not teach [others] to do what he himself does, he shall not

be judged by you; for his judgment is with God; for even thus did the ancient prophets act. But whosoever says 'in the Spirit,' Give me money or something else, him hear ye not; if, however, he speaks of gifts in reference to others who are in need, then no one shall judge him.

"12. Every one that cometh in the name of the Lord, let him be received; but then ye shall examine him and learn what his case may be, for ye should have the power of distinguishing between the good and the evil. If the new comer is a wanderer, help him as much as ye can. He will, however, not stay with you, unless it be for two or three days, if it be necessary. But if he wishes to take up his abode among you as a workman, then he is to work and eat. If, however, he has learned no trade, then ye shall according to your intelligent perception [of the case] see to it that no one without occupation live with you as a Christian. If he will not agree to this, then he is one who puts Christ out at usury. Hold yourselves aloof from such.

"13. Every true prophet, however, who desires to establish himself among you, is worthy of his support. Likewise, also, is a true teacher as a workman, worthy of his support. All the firstlings of the products of thy wine-press and threshing-floor, of thy cattle and sheep shalt thou take and give to the prophet, for they are your high priests. But if ye have no prophet [among you], then give it to the poor. When thou makest a batch of dough, take the first of it and give it according to the ordinance. So likewise when thou openest a vessel of wine or oil, take the first of it and give it to the prophet. Take also the firstlings of gold and clothes and of every possession according to thy discretion and give them according to the ordinance.

“ 14. On the Lord's day ye shall gather yourselves together and break the bread and say thanks, after ye have confessed your misdeeds, in order that your offering may be clean. Let no one who is at odds with his friend assemble with you, before they have become at one with each other, in order that your offering may not be profaned. This is what the word spoken by the Lord has reference to: ‘In every place and at every time shall they offer me a pure offering. For I am a great king, saith the Lord, and my name is wonderful among the nations.’

“ 15. Choose for yourselves, besides, bishops and deacons, who are worthy of the Lord, gentle and not miserly, and upright and proven men; for they perform also for you the service of the prophets and teachers. Despise them not, therefore, for they are your honored men [this passage is not perfectly clear] with the prophets and teachers. Convince one another not in anger but in peace, as ye find it in the gospel, and if a man have injured his neighbor, let no one speak to him, nor let him hear a word from you until he has changed his mind. But your prayers and your alms and all that ye do, so do it as ye find it in the gospel of our Lord.

“ 16. Watch over your life; your lamps shall not go out and your loins shall not become slack; but be ready, for ye know not the hour in which our Lord cometh. Ye shall, moreover, assemble yourselves together often, and seek after that which your souls need; for the whole [past] time of your belief will not be of the least use to you, if ye have grown perfect in the last time. For in the last days the false prophets and the corrupters will increase, and the sheep shall turn themselves into wolves, and love will turn to

hatred; for when unrighteousness assumes sway, they will hate and persecute and deliver up one another, and then the deceiver of the world will appear, as if he were the Son of God, and will do signs and wonders, and the earth shall be delivered into his hands, and he will do wickedness such as has never been since the beginning of time. Then will the creation of men [that is, all men] come into the fire of proving, and many will take offense and be lost. Those, however, who continue firm in their belief will be saved [here follows a doubtful clause]. And then the signs of the truth will appear: first the sign that the heaven opens, then the sign of the trumpet blast, and, third, the resurrection of the dead, yet not of all, but as is said: 'The Lord will come and all the saints with him.' Then will the world see the Lord come upon the clouds of heaven."

Thus far the "Teaching." Look around at the Christian Church, at your own particular church and congregation, and see how much can still be found of the simplicity in thought, in order, in worship, in life, which breathes in every line of this book.—*The Independent*.

BAALBEC.—Everything is colossal. The area is larger than that of the Temple at Jerusalem. We may begin with the walls, which are half a mile around, and of such height and depth as are rarely attained in the most tremendous fortress. When from within I climbed to the top, it made me giddy to look over the perilous edge to the depth below; and when from without the walls I looked up at them, they rose high in air. Some of the stones seem as if they must have been reared in place, not by Titans, but by the gods. There

are nine stones thirty feet long and ten feet thick, which is larger than the foundation-stones of the Temple at Jerusalem, dating from the time of Solomon, or any blocks in the Great Pyramid. But even these are pigmies compared with the three giants of the western wall—sixty-two, sixty-three and a half and sixty-four feet long! These are said to be the largest stones ever used in any construction. They weigh hundreds of tons, and instead of being merely hewn out of a quarry which might have been on the site, and left to lie where they were before, they have been lifted nineteen feet from the ground, and there embedded in the wall! Never was there such Cyclopean architecture. How such enormous masses could be moved is a problem with modern engineers. Sir Charles Wilson, whom I met in Jerusalem, is at this moment in Baalbec. Standing in the grounds of the Temple, he tells me that in the British Museum there is an ancient tablet which reveals the way in which such stones were moved. The mechanics were very simple. Rollers were put under them, and they were drawn up inclined planes by sheer human muscle—the united strength of great numbers of men. In the rude design on the tablet, the whole scene is pictured to the eye. There are the battalions of men, hundreds to a single roller, with the task-masters standing over them, lash in hand, which was freely applied to make them pull together, and the king sitting on high to give the signal for this putting forth of human strength *en masse*, as if an army were moving to battle. A battle it was in the waste of human life it caused. These Temples of Baalbec must have been a whole generation in building, and have consumed the population of a province and the wealth of an empire.—*Dr. H. M. Field, in the Evangelist.*